

EBRPD Master Plan 2013 Response to Comments and Comment List Introduction

During the course of public review of its Master Plan in 2012, the District accepted public comment by mail, email and through its website over a period of two months. In addition, the District's Board of Directors hosted six local community forums in both Alameda and Contra Costa Counties, during which staff noted on "flip charts" the oral comments made by forum participants. All told, 1,367 written and oral comments were gathered during the review period. A listing of all the comments received is attached at the end of this document.

Through this comment gathering process, many duplicate comments were received on a number of issues, including several mass-mailed letters sent out by special interest groups. Comments of this type have been consolidated into one representative comment and a single response is provided for that comment. Comments that proposed specific changes or were otherwise directly relevant to proposed Master Plan policies are referenced by number and responded to in the Response to Comment documents. In other cases, where people have made comments about particular parks, likes and dislikes or other issues not directly related to the Draft Master Plan text, these comments are included in the Comment List at the end of this appendix for the information and consideration of the Park District's Board of Directors, staff and other members of the public.

Please note that the Response to Comment documents is organized by the chapters and subject headings in the Master Plan that they address. All recommended changes in accordance with comments are incorporated into in this Final Draft Master Plan which is provided to the Board for its consideration.

Board of Directors

John Sutter
President
Ward 2

Ayn Wieskamp
Vice-President
Ward 5

Whitney Dotson
Treasurer
Ward 1

Ted Radke
Secretary
Ward 7

Beverly Lane
Ward 6

Carol Severin
Ward 3

Doug Siden
Ward 4

Robert E. Doyle
General Manager

Summary of Master Plan Changes from Response to Comment to Admin Draft

~~Strikethrough~~ = language deleted for this draft

Underline = language added for this draft

Chapter 1 Changes

Change 1: Under **Affirming the role and identity of the Regional Parks** revise the sentence to read:

- “...~~unique~~ recreational experiences like wilderness hiking, horseback riding, and fishing, that are directly related to this open space and are close by and easily accessible to East Bay area residents.”

Change 2: Add new bullet under **To achieve this Vision the District will:**

- Monitor the effects of climate change on District resources and utilize adaptive management techniques to adjust stewardship methods and priorities to preserve the natural, cultural and scenic values of the parks and trails.

Change 3: Under **To achieve this Vision the District will:**

- “Balance environmental concerns and outdoor recreational opportunities within regional parklands” is now bullet number 4 instead of bullet number 6

Change 4: Under **Responding to Changes in Demographics** revise the “We are more diverse” paragraph as follows:

- “We are more diverse: According to the 2010 Census, “minorities” now make up more than one third of the population of the United States. Within the jurisdiction of the Park District, While the white population has declined by 56% since the 2000 census and now represents just 49.4% of the combined-populations of Alameda and Contra Costa Counties in addition, the African American population has also declined 1.5% to become 11.2% for the combined populations of Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. In contrast, the Hispanic and Asian populations have increased by 35 and 36%, respectively, over their 2000 levels and now represent 23 and 21%, respectively of the combined population.”

Change 5: Under **The Special Role of Regional Parks**, add the underlined text to the paragraph:

- “...preserve water resources, native plants, wildlife habitat...”

Change 6: Under **Supporting the Shift to Green Communities** make the following revisions:

- “Increased fuel ~~and~~ /energy costs and a limited supply of potable water will impede the District’s 111,000 acre, two-county, 65-park operation, making the reuse and recycling of resources essential and the investigation into alternative energy sources and adoption of the recycling water and water efficient technology vital to developing a sustainable operational program...”

Chapter 2 Changes

Change 7: **RMI** is revised to read:

- **RMI: The District will maintain an active inventory of its resources and monitor their health and viability. When access to park areas by the public, or other factors, are negatively impacting these resources the District may institute seasonal closures of trails or staging areas to allow these resources and their environs to rest and recover.**

Change 8: Under the **Vegetation Management** section:

- Insert a new first paragraph under Vegetation Management, which reads:
 - The Park District is the largest steward of publicly held land in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. The District’s role in managing vegetation to preserve and improve native habitat values is key to the health and biodiversity of these important public natural reservations.
- Make the following text changes:
 - The District wildlands reflect the plant communities of the Bay Area. They contain a diverse mixture of native and non-native trees and shrubs, as well as annual and perennial herbaceous plants. Land use and vegetation changes over the past two centuries have irreversibly altered the landscape. This makes it necessary to use adaptive management techniques to ~~maintain a balance between native and non-native vegetation and to achieve~~ favor native vegetation where

possible, while simultaneously achieving wildland fuel and invasive weed management objectives.

- Examples include groves of exotic eucalyptus, pine and cypress trees, weed infestations, farm fields, golf courses, orchards and cultivated land. Areas of native vegetation, some shrubland, and woodland areas where wildland and urban areas are contiguous will be managed primarily to provide a line of defense against wildfire, while simultaneously planning for and creating opportunities for reestablishment by less fuel-intensive native plant associations. In the Park Planning process, these areas will be designated as Special Management Features and the management of these areas will be consistent with the practices identified in the *Wildfire Hazard Reduction and Resource Management Plan*.
- Interior park vegetation, remote from homes, should not generally be managed except for the purpose encouraging more native ~~and natural~~ plant communities.
- Native grassland areas should be preserved and in some cases re-established to retain this important plant community in East Bay Hill parks. Ridge tops and south/west slopes are appropriate as grasslands and in most cases will require ongoing grazing, mechanical or other Integrated Pest Management (IPM) strategies to control brush invasion where necessary.
- Management of exotic eucalyptus and pine plantations to reduce fire risks is necessary and appropriate. While conversion from eucalyptus or pine to native habitat will not be accomplished easily, transition to a grassland/brush mix, oak/bay woodland or other appropriate native, plant community is a long-term goal.

Change 9: Revise **NRM6** to read:

- **NRM6: The District will evaluate exotic eucalyptus, Monterey pine and cypress plantations, shrubland or woodland areas occurring along the wildland/urban interface on a case-by-case basis for thinning, removal and/or conversion to a less fire-prone condition, following the methods laid out in the Fuels Management Plan. The District will ~~work towards minimizing~~ minimize the widespread encroachment of exotic and/or invasive species such as monotypic stands of coyote brush, poison oak and broom, etc. on parkland and work to preserve native plants where feasible.**

Change 10: Under **Vegetation Management** make the following revisions:

- Other resource management methods, such as using machinery to crush, ~~uproot and~~ mow, ~~disk~~, or cut down vegetation, are useful in managing wildland resources on a small scale. Integrated pest management (IPM) provides ecologically compatible

practices and treatment strategies for the control of plant and animal pests (Refer to *Pest Management Policies and Practices* [See Appendix 1]).

Change 11: A new NRM12 (11b) policy is proposed under **Water Management**:

- **NRM 12(11b): The District will pursue conservation and control technologies for the conservation and use of potable and irrigation water. The District will seek to reduce the use of imported water for uses other than human consumption through conservation and by developing other sources of water for irrigation and non-potable needs.**

Change 12: Revise **CRM1** to state:

- **CRM1: The District will manage, conserve and restore parkland cultural and historic resources and sites to preserve the heritage of the people that occupied this land before the District was established and continue to encourage the cultural traditions associated with the land today.**

Change 13: Revise **CRM5** to state:

- **CRM5: The District will notify Native American and other culturally associated peoples in a timely manner of plans which may affect sites and landscapes significant to their culture, and will include them in discussions regarding the preservation and land use planning of culturally significant sites and landscapes.**

Change 14: Revise **CRM6** to state:

- **CRM6: The District will ~~try~~ strive to accommodate requests by ~~ranching or farming families,~~ Native Americans and other culturally affiliated groups to help maintain and use cultural sites and play and active volunteer role in their preservation and interpretation.**

Chapter 3 Changes

Change 15: Revise **PA1** to state:

- ▶ **PA1:** The District will use the concepts of the Healthy Parks / Healthy People movement to focus its outreach and education efforts. To achieve the goals of the Healthy Parks / Healthy People movement the District will partner with other park, recreation and community organizations as well as with schools, local health providers and businesses to provide opportunities for families and individuals to experience both traditional and non-traditional types of outdoor activities while reconnecting to the outdoors.

Change 16: Revise **PA5** to state:

- **PA5:** The District will cooperate with local and regional planning efforts to create more walkable and bike-able communities and coordinate park access opportunities with local trails and bike paths developed by other agencies to promote green transportation access to the Regional Parks and Trails.

Change 17: Revise **RFA2** to state:

- **RFA2:** The District will provide a diverse system of non-motorized trails to accommodate a variety of recreational users including hikers, joggers, people with dogs, bicyclists and equestrians. Both wide and narrow trails will be designed and designated to accommodate either single-or multiple users, as appropriate, based on location, recreational intensity, environmental and safety considerations. The District will focus on appropriate trail planning and design, signage and trail user education to promote safety and minimize conflicts between users. Trails will be designated for shared-use only when there is a history or reasonable assurance of safety and minimal conflict between users.

Change 18: Revise **RFA3** to state:

- **RFA3:** The District will continue to add narrow trails designed as both single- and multi-use for hikers, equestrians, people with dogs and bike

riders throughout the system of regional parklands.

Change 19: Under **Trails** in the “Dedicated and Shared Use Narrow Trails” section, add the following language:

- In keeping with the District interest in providing trails for all, the design and development of narrow trails open to bike riding, including the selective narrowing of existing wide ranch roads and fire trails, will be considered on a park-by-park basis in the land use plan process.

Chapter 4 Changes

Change 20: Revise **KEPI** to state:

- **KEP I: The District will notify the public about the publication of plans, including proposed design of major new facilities, and the scheduled times for public review and comment.**

Change 21: Under **Planning and Management Guidelines for Recreation/Staging Units** make the following changes:

- Where feasible, the District will provide multi-use opportunities on ~~Regional~~ trails within the same trail corridor. Bicycling and equestrian paths will be separate wherever possible, although they may share a common corridor. ~~Regional~~ Trails should be wide enough to accommodate designated users. The use of motorized vehicles is prohibited on Regional Trails unless they conform to the Board approved definition of a “Power-Driven Mobility Device” used by a person with impaired mobility as delineated in the **Interim Policy on the Use of Other Power-Driven Mobility Devices**, which Policy shall be consistent with the applicable provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

CHAPTER I- INTRODUCTION

Comment I-2: P. 13 line 10; "...unique recreational experiences like hiking, horseback riding, and fishing..." These activities can be experienced at State and National parks, some city parks and at private stables and preserves. These activities are not unique to regional parks. Commenter suggests re-evaluating the concept that is trying to be conveyed in this section.

Response I-1: Subject sentence to be revised to read "...unique recreational experiences like wilderness hiking, horseback riding, and fishing, that are directly related to this open space and are close by and easily accessible to East Bay area residents."

Comment I-3: Global warming is not addressed until the Priorities Section and then is only as the 5th in the list. Acknowledge this issue with a statement in the 12 bullet section addressing the District's strategies for achieving its vision. (p.6)

Response I-2: Add new bullet to p. 6; Monitor the effects of climate change on District resources and utilize adaptive management techniques to adjust stewardship methods and priorities to preserve the natural, cultural and scenic values of the parks and trails.

Comment I-4: Revise Mission statement as follows:

~~The EBRPD preserves a rich~~ will continue its heritage of preserving natural and cultural resources, consisting of and provides open space, parks, trails, open space , and programs safe and healthful recreation and environmental education. ~~An~~ and with the guidance of an environmental ethic, will provide opportunities for healthful recreation and environmental education ~~guides the District in all of its activities.~~

Response I-3: Proposed rewording is not substantially different or better. No revision is necessary.

Comment I-5: Mission statement says EBRPD provides "safe open space". Maybe the phrase "law abiding" is better because it doesn't imply a person is safe from rattle snakes, poison oak, heat exhaustion, etc.

Response I-4: Mission provides for "safe and healthful recreation..." the enforcement of laws is one part of the Park District's "Public Safety" effort.

Comment I-6: P. 6; Move Bullet #6 (Balanced environmental concerns and recreation... up to be bullet #4.

Response I-5: Bullets to be reordered as proposed.

Comment I-7: Ways to achieve vision plan: last bullet says, "Pursue all appropriate activities to ensure the fiscal health..... This could mean races and franchises. We recommend adding the phrase "without compromising natural resource protection nor lessening the enjoyment of the park experience for park users not involved in those activities"

Response I-6: The words “appropriate activities”, considered in the context of the Mission statement provides these assurances.

Comment I-8: Revise Vision statement as follows: "... open space parkland in ~~Alameda and Contra Costa~~ counties, which will forever provide geographically close and fair share access the opportunity for a ~~growing and~~ diverse community to experience nature well into the foreseeable future nearby.

Response I-7: The District’s jurisdiction specifically includes Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. Proposed rewording is not substantially different or better.

Comment I-9: Revise Vision statement as follows, 3rd bullet: Interpret the parklands by focusing educational programs on the visitor's relationship to nature, natural recreational, processes, ecology, the value of natural conditions and the history of the parklands.

Response I-8: The addition of the word recreation is not appropriate here.

Comment I-10: Vision statement, 7th bullet: Provide recreational development that fosters appropriate use of parklands while preserving their remoteness and intrinsic value. Comment is to change the wording because preserving their intrinsic value would seem to include the issue of appropriate use.

Response I-9: The desire to foster “appropriate use” is not limited to preserving “intrinsic value”.

Comment I-11,13,15-17,19,22,27,28,33: Good job

Response I-10: Comments noted and appreciated.

Comment I-23: P. 14; Under “We are more diverse:” African Americans are omitted and in Alameda Co. they are 13% of population and in CCC are 9% of the population.

Response I-11: Revise the paragraph as follows: “

We are more diverse: According to the 2010 Census, “minorities” now make up more than one third of the population of the United States. Within the jurisdiction of the Park District, ~~While~~ the white population has declined by 56% since the 2000 census and now represents just 49.4% of the combined-populations of Alameda and Contra Costa Counties in addition, the African American population has also declined 1.5% to become 11.2% for the combined populations of Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. In contrast, the Hispanic and Asian populations have increased by 35 and 36%, respectively, over their 2000 levels and now represent 23 and 21%, respectively of the combined population.

Comment I-25: Revise the last paragraph on p. 7 to read: "...preserve water resources, native plant and wildlife habitat..."

Response I-12: Revise subject sentence to read; "...preserve water resources, native plants, wildlife habitat..."

Comment I-26: Revise the first paragraph, p. 9 to read: "The large amount of natural habitat preserved by these parklands supports a healthy native plant ecosystem ~~for plants~~ and wildlife habitat."

Response I-13: Habitat goals for the District are broader than just native plant ecosystems. No revision is required.

Comment I-29: Incorporate sustainable agriculture in the Mission Statement.

Response I-14: The District manages its vegetative resources with a goal of creating a landscape that can sustain itself with very little management. Agricultural practices require an on-going manipulation of the land to keep it productive. Excluding the interpretive value of the historic use of the land in this manner, agricultural processes on District's lands would be inconsistent with this objective.

Comment I-30: Provide more opportunities to get to the parks without cars for low income, urban people.

Response I-15: The opportunities to provide regional open space areas within an urban environment are severely limited but most possible along the shorelines. The District has consistently looked to the acquisition of urban shorelines and will continue to do this to meet need. The District also makes every effort to coordinate with public transit agencies and provide park users with information on transit accessibility (Please see the District's website for information public access information provided under individual park listintngs).

Comment I-31,32: Increase public outreach to involve communities that do not traditionally support the Park District and very aggressively target "new" and "underserved" communities so they know the parks are there and theirs.

Response I-16: The means described to achieve the Vision of the District directly addresses this issue, making it an on-going priority for the District.

Comment I-34, 35: What will the District do to ensure the survey methods used... are scientifically valid. Phone and on-line surveys were skewed...

Response I-17: The District contracts with consultants with expertise in these methods to assure that the phone surveys are scientifically valid and will continue to do so. The on-line survey was never intended to be a scientifically valid survey, but was done to identify special interest groups and popular issues that need to be considered in contrast to the science based results.

Comment I-36: Add a statement on safety to the Vision statement.

Response I-18: The current Mission Statement includes; “The East Bay Regional Park District preserves a rich heritage of natural and cultural resources and provides open space, parks, trails, **safe** and healthful recreation and environmental education...”

Comment PAC: Pages 16-17; Supporting the Shift to Green Communities - PAC suggests amending second bullet to include reference to the challenges the District will face with projected potable water shortages and the associated increase in operating costs requiring water conservation and potential adoption of water recycling and water efficient technology for its facilities and irrigated lands (golf courses, water slides, etc.).

“Increased fuel ~~and~~ /energy costs and a limited supply of potable water will impede the District’s 111,000 acre, two-county, 65-park operation, making the reuse and recycling of resources essential and the investigation into alternative energy sources and adoption of the recycling water and water efficient technology vital to developing a sustainable operational program...”

Response I-19: Comment acknowledged. The suggested language will be incorporated into the Master Plan text.

CHAPTER 2 – NATURAL AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (RM)

- ▶ **RMI:** The District will maintain an active inventory of its resources and monitor their health and viability. When access to park areas by the public is negatively impacting these resources the District may institute seasonal closures of trails or staging areas to allow these resources and their environs to rest and recover.

Comment 2-38,158: Public access is important and necessary, but when/where should be informed by habitat preservation goals. There is no mention of the role of biological research to support goal to “monitor their health and viability.”

Response 2-1: Current wording in RMI sets preservation of resources as a priority and is rooted in on-going research and stewardship. Please see policy NRM3, below.

Comment 2-36,37,39,50,52: Add “livestock” to the list of factors which can damage resources.

Response 2-2: Many factors, including natural factors such as water and erosion can damage land and resources. The policy is proposed to be revised to read:

- ▶ **RMI:** The District will maintain an active inventory of its resources and monitor their health and viability. When access to park areas by the public, or other factors, are negatively impacting these resources the District may institute seasonal closures of trails or staging areas to allow these resources and their environs to rest and recover.

NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT (NRM)

- ▶ **NRM1:** The District will maintain, manage, conserve, enhance and restore park wildland resources to protect essential plant and animal habitat within viable, sustainable ecosystems.

Comment (PAC): The District should include a sustainable water policy within resource management.

Response 2-3: The definition of park “wildland resources” includes water and all other resources necessary for functional ecosystems and sustainable wildlife habitat.

- ▶ **NRM3:** The District will manage park wildlands using modern resource management practices based on scientific principles supported by available

research. New scientific information will be incorporated into the planning and implementation of District wildland management programs as it becomes available. The District will coordinate with other agencies and organizations in a concerted effort to inventory, evaluate and manage natural resources and to maintain and enhance the biodiversity of the region. (Existing policy, unchanged from 1997)

Comment 2-160: District should do more to monitor the status of natural resources and the effectiveness of its management policies and share the results of this monitoring.

Response 2-4: The District's Stewardship Department regularly monitors the status of selected special status and indicator species and habitat. Many of the monitoring results are presented to the public at an annual Stewardship Seminar, and are also displayed on the Resource Stewardship page of the District's website.

Comment 2-22: Natural resource management, including rare and endangered species habitat, vegetation and prescribed fire, should recognize the value of traditional knowledge. The District should include Native Americans in the management of natural resources.

Response 2-5: The Park District's management of natural resources is guided, and constrained, by a number of factors: 1) Methodologies and management practices arising out of current "best science"; 2) laws, regulations and permit conditions governing listed species, water resources, etc.; 3) considerations of public safety and risk, particularly with regard to the use of prescribed fire at the wildland-urban interface; and 4) best use of available financial and staff resources. While traditional practices may arguably be superior to contemporary "best science" and regulatory approaches, these approaches are part of a legal, regulatory framework with which the District must comply. Furthermore, traditional practices such as burning, which evolved in pre-European settlement times and wildland conditions may be inappropriate, unsafe or excessively costly in semi-rural situations or in parkland with recreational users. Nevertheless, the District is open to further discussion of these issues in future meetings with knowledgeable and experienced Native American practitioners. Please see responses to comments under CRM5, below.

Comment 2-162: The section on vegetation management seems too specific to the East Bay hills.

Response 2-6: This section does apply to the general management of vegetation throughout the District, where minimal manipulation is expected. However, a significant portion of it is focused on policy NRM6 and the procedures which define the active management programs and techniques to be used in this wildland/urban interface zone; due to the level of manipulation required to manage this area.

Vegetation Management

Comment 2-41- 46: Revise text, as follows:

p. 24 Insert a new first paragraph under Vegetation Management, which reads:

The Park District is the largest steward of publicly held land in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. The District's role in managing vegetation to preserve and improve native habitat values is key to the health and biodiversity of these important public natural reservations.

The District wildlands reflect the plant communities of the Bay Area. They contain a diverse mixture of native and non-native trees and shrubs, as well as annual and perennial herbaceous plants. Land use and vegetation changes over the past two centuries have irreversibly altered the landscape. This makes it necessary to use adaptive management techniques to ~~maintain a balance between native and non-native vegetation and to achieve~~ favor native vegetation where possible, while simultaneously achieving wildland fuel and invasive weed management objectives.

p. 25 Examples include groves of exotic eucalyptus, pine and cypress trees, weed infestations, farm fields, golf courses, orchards and cultivated land. Areas of native vegetation, some shrubland, and woodland areas where wildland and urban areas are contiguous will be managed primarily to provide a line of defense against wildfire, while simultaneously planning for and creating opportunities for reestablishment by less fuel-intensive native plant associations. In the Park Planning process, these areas will be designated as Special Management Features and the management of these areas will be consistent with the practices identified in the *Wildfire Hazard Reduction and Resource Management Plan*.

p.26 Interior park vegetation, remote from homes, should not generally be managed except for the purpose encouraging more native ~~and natural~~ plant communities.

- Native grassland areas should be preserved and in some cases re-established to retain this important plant community in East Bay Hill parks. Ridge tops and south/west slopes are appropriate as grasslands and in most cases will require ongoing grazing, mechanical or other Integrated Pest Management (IPM) strategies to control brush invasion where necessary.
- Management of exotic eucalyptus and pine plantations to reduce fire risks is necessary and appropriate. While conversion from eucalyptus or pine to native habitat will not be accomplished easily, transition to a grassland/brush mix, oak/bay woodland or other appropriate native, plant community is a long-term goal.

Response 2-7: The District will incorporate the proposed text revisions.

- ▶ **NRM5: The District will maintain and manage vegetation to conserve, enhance and restore natural plant communities; to preserve and protect populations of rare, threatened, endangered and sensitive plant species and their habitats; and where possible, to protect biodiversity and to achieve a high representation of native plants and animals.**

Note: This policy is carried forth from the 1997 Master Plan with no proposed changes.

Comment 2-24,25: Make the following revisions to Policy NRM5:

NRM5: The District will maintain and manage vegetation to conserve, enhance and restore ~~natural-native~~ plant communities; as well as to preserve and protect populations of rare, threatened, endangered and sensitive plant species and their habitats; to promote and restore, where appropriate, to protect biodiversity and to achieve a high representation of native plants and animals. The District will map its significant native vegetation resources and develop management plans for them.

Response 2-8: The District currently works to restore and enhance native plant communities and habitat in general, within the constraints of budgetary and staff resources. These activities are adequately addressed in the existing policy. Therefore, no change is proposed.

- ▶ **NRM6: The District will evaluate eucalyptus, pine and cypress plantations, shrubland or woodland areas occurring along the wildland/urban interface on a case-by-case basis for thinning, removal and/or conversion to a less fire-prone condition, following the methods laid out in the Fuels Management Plan. The District will work toward minimizing the widespread encroachment of monotypic stands of coyote brush, poison oak and broom on parkland.**

Comments 2-27,29,31,67: Continue to manage for fire safety. Why have references to fuel breaks and fuel management been stricken? Provide clearer language on treatment of invasives, shrubland or woodland may be native plants, native habitats need to be considered. Make the following revisions to NRM6:

NRM6: The District will evaluate exotic eucalyptus, pine and cypress plantations, ~~shrubland~~ or woodland on a case-by case basis for thinning or removal to a less fire-prone condition, following the methods laid out in the Fuels Management Plan. The District will ~~work toward minimizing~~ minimize the widespread encroachment of exotic invasive species such as monotypic stands of coyote brush, ~~poison oak and broom,~~ pampas grass, teasel, Himalayan blackberry, etc. on parkland.

Response 2-9: The only change to this policy from the 1997 Master Plan is the acknowledgment of the 2010 Fuels Management Plan (Wildfire Hazard Reduction and Resource Management Plan), which is substituted for the former reference to “fuel breaks.” The District will make the following revisions:

- ▶ **NRM6: The District will evaluate exotic eucalyptus, Monterey pine and cypress plantations, shrubland or woodland areas occurring along the wildland/urban interface on a case-by-case basis for thinning, removal and/or conversion to a less fire-prone condition, following the methods laid out in the Fuels Management Plan. The District will minimize the widespread encroachment of exotic and/or invasive species such as monotypic stands of coyote brush, poison oak and broom, etc. on parkland and work to preserve native plants where feasible.**

Comment 2-150: Stop trying to prevent natural succession from grassland to scrub. It is pointless and requires polluting and dangerous prescribed burns and toxic herbicides. Unnatural methods are being used to prevent a natural process which is not sustainable.

Response 2-10: Wildland has been managed to maintain open grassland and prevent brush encroachment since pre-European settlement times. Native Americans maintained open grassland for game habitat and fruit and seed production by fire; later, European settlers used maintained open land with cattle grazing. The Park District reduces brush encroachment for three reasons: 1) fuels management, to reduce fire hazard; 2) to create ecotones or edge habitat for diverse species; and 3) to maintain open space and viewsheds for recreation. The district maintains open space in brush land primarily by grazing and mowing. With the exception of invasive species control, herbicide use plays a minimal role.

Comment 2-151, 153: Stop trying to destroy native trees. They are storing tons of carbon which will be released in the atmosphere as carbon dioxide when they are destroyed, contributing to climate change. They are not more flammable than the grassland and scrub which is native to California.

Comment 2-153: Don't buy more land until you eliminate eucalyptus, broom and other invasives.

Response 2-11: Long-time District practice calls for the thinning and selective removal of eucalyptus and other introduced tree species which, contrary to the first comment, are well known fire hazards. This practice has been thoroughly reviewed in the 2010 Wildfire Hazard Reduction and Resource Management Plan and EIR. Unfortunately, it is difficult or impossible to completely eliminate invasive species; but the District's goal is to manage their spread.

Comment 2-152: Agro and urban ecology partnerships to manage and use opportunistic species for uses such as herbal medicines, forage and construction materials.

Response 2-12: The District manages its vegetative resources with a goal of creating a landscape that can sustain itself with very little manipulation. Agricultural practices require an on-going manipulation of the land to keep it productive. Excluding the interpretive value of the historic use of the land in this manner, agricultural processes on District's lands would be inconsistent with this objective.

Comments 2-23,28,30-32: Coyote bush and poison oak should not be considered and treated as invasive species and targeted for wholesale removal.

Response 2-13: The District recognizes the habitat value of these native plant communities, while also recognizing that they may contribute to fire hazard in certain areas, may be an obstacle to hiking, views and public access, and may dominate the landscape and reduce optimum habitat values. For these reasons, the policy states: "*The District will **evaluate** ... shrubland or woodland ... **on a case-by-case basis** for **thinning**, removal and/or conversion to a less fire-prone condition, following the methods laid out in the Fuels Management Plan. The District will*

minimize the widespread encroachment of monotypic stands of coyote brush, poison oak and broom on parkland.” The District’s approach to managing these plant communities is highly selective.

Comment 2-47, 68: Disking should not be included in the District’s vegetation management practices because it cultivates weeds. Use controlled burns instead of goat grazing, make the following revisions to the text:

- p. 27 Research has demonstrated that active management using controlled livestock grazing and prescribed burning programs, carried out at key times of the year, can be effective in maintaining balanced and diverse ecosystems. Other resource management methods, such as using machinery to crush, ~~uproot and~~ mow, ~~disk,~~ or cut down vegetation, are useful in managing wildland resources on a small scale. Integrated pest management (IPM) provides ecologically compatible practices and treatment strategies for the control of plant and animal pests (Refer to *Pest Management Policies and Practices* [See Appendix I]). Fire management activities are carried out, as necessary, to reduce or maintain wildland fuels at acceptable levels.

Response 2-14: The District will make these revisions to the text and continue to use prescribed burns and goat grazing as appropriate.

- ▶ **NRM8: The District will conserve, enhance and restore biological resources to promote naturally functioning ecosystems. Conservation efforts may involve using managed grazing in accordance with the District’s Wildland Management Policies and Guidelines, prescribed burning, mechanical treatments, Integrated Pest Management and/or habitat protection and restoration. Restoration activities may involve the removal of invasive plants and animals or the reintroduction of native or naturalized species adapted to or representative of a given site.**

Comment 2-35: Strike the words “or naturalized” from the last sentence. Reintroduction of naturalized species is not appropriate, as they may become invasive. Only native plants should be used.

Response 2-15: The District does many small scale restoration projects, for example to revegetate disturbed soil and prevent erosion. While restoration with native species is always preferable, it is not always practical. Adapted or naturalized grass species are often more successful at establishing themselves and resisting weed invasion, so these species are often incorporated into a seed mix along with native seeds. The District never uses plants listed as “invasive” by the California Invasive Plant Council.

Comment 2-172: Re-plant trees from fuels management/eucalyptus removal.

Response 2-16: The removal process leaves the root system of the trees in place to reduce the possibility of soil erosion. Removal of these fire-prone and/or invasive species creates

room for native or naturalized understory species to grow. Thus the landscape becomes self-restorative.

- ▶ **NRM9: The District will conserve and protect native animal species and enhance their habitats to maintain viable wildlife populations within balanced ecosystems. Non-native and feral animals will be managed to minimize conflicts with native wildlife species. The District will cooperate on a regular basis with other public and private land managers and recognized wildlife management experts to address wildlife management issues on a regional scale.**

Comment 2-34: Revise the end of the first sentence to read "...viable wildlife populations within balanced native ecosystems."

Response 2-17: The scale of the District holdings requires the latitude to work in balanced ecosystems that may include naturalized plant species. No revision to the policy is proposed.

Water Resources

Comment 2-19: The Board should include a policy statement for the reduction of potable water consumption in park facilities.

Response 2-18: A new NRM12 (11b) policy is proposed:

- ▶ **NRM 12(11b): The District will pursue conservation and control technologies for the conservation and use of potable and irrigation water. The District will seek to reduce the use of imported water for uses other than human consumption through conservation and by developing other sources of water for irrigation and non-potable needs.**

CULTURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

- ▶ **CRM1: The District will manage, conserve and restore parkland cultural and historic resources and sites, to preserve the heritage of the people that occupied this land before the District was established.**

Comments 2-1,3,5,7,18,56,59,82,85,93,101-103,105,110,113: Wording should be changed to recognize that Ohlone, Bay Miwok and other Native Peoples continue to inhabit this area and maintain their traditions in a living culture. "We are still here and it is still our land. California and the United states never legally acquired these lands from our ancestors. Whatever money is exchanged for realty is not recognized as legitimate exchange; it is buying stolen property."

Response 2-19: The language of the policy will be revised to state:

- ▶ **CRM1: The District will manage, conserve and restore parkland cultural and historic resources and sites to preserve the heritage of the people that occupied this land before the District was established and continue to encourage the cultural traditions associated with the land today.**

-
- ▶ **CRM4: The District will determine the level of public access to cultural and historic resources using procedures and practices adopted by the Board of Directors. The District will employ generally accepted best management practices to minimize the impact of public use and access on these resources, and to appropriately interpret the significance of these resources on a regional scale.**

Comments, 2-9,10,61,77,79,88,100,106,123,133,136,137,147: Local Native Americans, not the District, should determine the level of public access to their historic tribal lands. Best management practices should follow State and National Parks and SBI8. Make the following revisions.

CRM4: ~~The District~~ Native American communities will determine the level of public access to their cultural and historic resources ~~using procedures and practices adopted by the Board of Directors.~~ The District will research the practices being employed and generally accepted as best management practices by State and Federal parks and SBI8 to minimize the impact of public use and access on these resources, and to ~~appropriately~~ interpret the significance of these resources on a regional scale when appropriate.

Response 2-20: The Park District acquires land using public money from taxes, voter-approved bonds and the like. The District's mission is to provide outdoor recreational opportunities to the all of the public while protecting a variety of natural and cultural resources. Through this Master Plan, the District reaffirms its commitment to meeting with Native Americans on plans and actions which may affect their cultural resources; however the District's Board of Directors has the ultimate responsibility to manage District lands and resources, and the District's Board of Directors must make final decisions regarding public access. The language of SBI8 applies to federally recognized tribal entities which have a formal leadership structure and decision-making process and are regarded, under federal law, as sovereign governments. That is not the case with most local tribal people in the East Bay, who are culturally affiliated individuals without an established, representative organization or decision-making process. However, by including these new Master Plan policies the District recognizes that there are legitimate Native American interests in land and resources managed by the District; and commits to engaging local Indian people in a meaningful dialogue about their interests. No revision to the policy is proposed.

Comments 2-2,20,75,83,138: The District should convene a Native American Advisory Board to oversee management and protection of sacred sites.

Response 2-21: The Park District Board of Directors has an advisory board (the Park Advisory Committee or PAC) that represents the interests of the constituents of the District. The PAC meets in a publicly noticed setting and always has the opportunity for public comment on its agendas. This committee offers local Indian groups and individuals the opportunity to provide input on all facets of the District and recommendations from the PAC are considered by the Board in their decision making.

- ▶ **CRM5: The District will include Native American and other culturally associated peoples in discussions regarding the preservation and land use planning of culturally significant sites and landscapes.**

Comments 2-6,11,12,15,16,57,73-75,80,81,84,87,90,92,95,97-99,104,107-109,114-117,121,122,130,143: The language of Policy CRM5 is vague and inadequate. Resource management and land use planning should involve early discussion with regional indigenous representatives prior to the development of the plan. The policy should commit to a specific process, including engaging with Native Americans *at least 90 days prior* to making changes to lands and resources significant to their culture.

Response 2-22: All of the Master Plan policies are designed to provide broad and general guidance which represents the Board's intent and overall policy direction. The District will modify the language of CRM5 to state:

- ▶ **CRM5: The District will notify Native American and other culturally associated peoples in a timely manner of plans which may affect sites and landscapes significant to their culture, and will include them in discussions regarding the preservation and land use planning of culturally significant sites and landscapes.**

-
- ▶ **CRM6: The District will try to accommodate requests by ranching or farming families, Native Americans and other culturally affiliated groups to help maintain and use cultural sites and play and active volunteer role in their preservation and interpretation.**

Comments 2-13,14,17,18,57: Strike the words "try to" from the policy. Native Americans are not a special interest group.

Response 2-23: As stated above, the District must attempt to balance considerations of cultural participation and education with other public access and resource management considerations. The District does already issue permits for special cultural gatherings, ceremonies and events. It also facilitates the "Ohlone Intern Program" and is open to considering the expansion of Native American participation in interpretation and cultural site monitoring. The policy is proposed to be revised as follows:

- ▶ **CRM6: The District will ~~try~~ strive to accommodate requests by ~~ranching or farming families,~~ Native Americans and other culturally affiliated groups to**

help maintain and use cultural sites and play and active volunteer role in their preservation and interpretation.

CHAPTER 3 PUBLIC ACCESS AND SERVICES

Comment 3-1: The wording of Policy PA3 should be revised as follows:

- ▶ **The District will regularly use ~~formal and informal~~ survey methods which provide information representative of park users. ~~to assess the interest of its constituents.~~ This information**

Response 3-1: This policy represents the District's current practice, and, as written, states the District's intent to use balanced and representative surveys to provide information on the recreational preferences of park users and other constituents. No revision to the language is necessary.

Comment 3-2: Add "schools" to Policy PAI and partner with schools and parents on transportation to parks.

Response 3-2: The Park District does already provide interpretive outreach programs to schools and youth programs, and provides transportation to parks and youth camps through its Parks Express program, supported by the Regional Parks Foundation. Providing a comprehensive transportation program from schools to parks, however, is beyond the financial abilities of the District. Conducting nature programs for kids is a key part of this Master Plan. Therefore, Policy PAI will be revised to read:

- ▶ **PAI: The District will use the concepts of the Healthy Parks / Healthy People movement to focus its outreach and education efforts. To achieve the goals of the Healthy Parks / Healthy People movement the District will partner with other park, recreation and community organizations as well as with schools, local health providers and businesses to provide opportunities for families and individuals to experience both traditional and non-traditional types of outdoor activities while reconnecting to the outdoors.**

Comment 3-3: Revise PAI as follows:

The District will use the concepts of the Healthy Parks / Healthy People movement to focus its outreach and education efforts, and to help decide park use activities. ~~To achieve the goals of the Healthy Parks / Healthy People movement the District will partner with other.....~~

Response 3-3: The proposed revision limits the application of the Healthy Parks / Healthy People initiative. A broader use of this concept is desired.

Comment 3-4,5: Amend Policy PA5 to include walkable and bike-able communities. Amend Policy PA5 to include local and regional planning efforts.

Response 3-4: Policy PA5 will be revised as follows:

- ▶ **PA5: The District will cooperate with local and regional planning efforts to create more walkable and bike-able communities and coordinate park access opportunities with local trails and bike paths developed by other agencies to promote green transportation access to the Regional Parks and Trails.**

Comment 3-6: Regarding **Policies PA-6 and -7**, has there been an evaluation of ADA accessibility and an implementation plan?

Response 3-5: The Park District completed the federally mandated Transition Plan for the Parks in 2006 and continues to retrofit existing facilities to accommodate the needs of park users with disabilities (Refer to the *ADA Self Evaluation and Transition Plan* [See Appendix I]).

Comments 3-32-37: The District should provide for agricultural leases to promote local food production and jobs.

Response 3-6: Please see response to comment I-29.

Trails

Comments 3-313-504: Numerous comments both supporting proposing and opposed to motorized OHV recreational use in the regional parks.

Response 3-7: In scoping the issues for this Master Plan, the District conducted two interest surveys of recreational interests and preferences: a scientifically valid telephone survey of (n=400) and an open, web-based user survey, which generated 6,294 responses. Of the total responses to both surveys, only one respondent indicated an interest in OHV use. A CA State Parks survey (2007) indicated that only 3.5% of respondents in the San Francisco Bay Area had participated in OHV recreation in the preceding year. EBRPD's surveys also indicated an overwhelming preference for *the preservation of natural open space and maintenance of existing facilities* as spending priorities, and, generally, for more passive, nature-oriented recreational activities, such as trail hiking and riding. This Master Plan also places a strong emphasis on outdoor exercise and fitness in its "Healthy Parks, Healthy People" theme.

These values are reflected in the following sections of the Master Plan text:

The **Introduction** to the Master Plan Document, under the section describing **The Special Role of Regional Parks**, states:

The Park District's goal is to preserve and provide access to the best remaining natural open lands in the East Bay through a connected system of regional parklands that preserve water resources, native plant and wildlife habitat, traces of the history of human occupation and use of this area... The valleys, canyons, large expanses of open space and shoreline areas provide seclusion and escape from the hustle and bustle of the surrounding urban environment. The large amount of natural habitat preserved by these parklands supports a healthy ecosystem for plants and wildlife.

Two points of the District's **Vision Statement**, at the beginning of the Master Plan, point to

the Board's vision of the unique character of regional parks:

...the District will:

- **Manage, maintain and restore the parklands so that they retain their important scenic, natural and cultural values.**
- **Provide recreational development that fosters appropriate use of parklands while preserving their remoteness and intrinsic value.**

During the public review of this Master Plan update, the District received more comments on the use of trails than on any other single topic. Comments either advocated for additional trail opportunities by various user groups—hikers, mountain bikers, equestrians or dog walkers—or pointed out conflicts among those user groups. The following paragraphs summarize those comments and indicate the District's general policy direction with regard to trail use. The Board of Directors will have a difficult job balancing the often competing or conflicting demands of various user groups in the light of the District's mandates of protecting the environment and providing for public safety while trying to equitably satisfy the demands of *existing, non-motorized* park and trail users.

Because of the reasons stated above, the first sentence of Policy RFA2 will be revised to state:

- ▶ **RFA2: The District will provide a diverse system of non-motorized trails to accommodate a variety of recreational users including hikers, joggers, dog owners, bicyclists and equestrians.**

Comment 3-12: Include Native Americans in consideration of trail alignment, construction and access in areas with sensitive cultural resources.

Response 3-8: Please see responses to comments 2-6, -11, -12, -15, -16, -57, -73-75, -80, -81, -84, -87, -90, -92, -95, -97-99, -104, -107-109, -114-117, -121, -122, -130, -143.

Comments 3-548-605: Comments supporting either shared, multi-use or single-use, dedicated trails.

Comments 3-15, 19, 38-44, 59-145: The District should provide more access for bicycles on narrow trails—both dedicated and shared use. Ordinance 38 should be amended to remove restrictions. Promote more youth mountain biking activities.

Comments 3-16-18, 57-58: There are too many conflicts between mountain bikes and other trail users. Bikes should be restricted to wide, multi-use trails or dedicated hiker / equestrian trails need to be provided. District needs to address conflicts and safety concerns between bicyclists, and other trail users through signage, education, enforcement of regulations.

Comment 3-150: The District should exclude bikes from regional preserves and sensitive natural areas like Claremont Canyon, where they damage the resources.

Comments 3-520, 522-539: The District needs to do a better job of providing signage and educating multiple-user groups on trail etiquette.

Response 3-9: In park user surveys conducted preceding this Master Plan, as well as in the comments received on the Draft, there was strong public support for both shared use and dedicated trails. Policies RFA2 and RFA3 clearly state the Board's intent to provide "Trails for All": access for multiple trail users to both wide and narrow, dedicated and shared-use trails. However, to acknowledge the importance of the safety of trail users, Policy RFA2 shall be revised as follows:

- ▶ **RFA2: The District will provide a diverse system of non-motorized trails to accommodate a variety of recreational users including hikers, joggers, dog owners, bicyclists and equestrians. Both wide and narrow trails will be designed and designated to accommodate either single-or multiple users, as appropriate, based on location, recreational intensity, environmental and safety considerations. The District will focus on appropriate trail planning and design, signage and trail user education to promote safety and minimize conflicts between users. Trails will be designated for shared-use only when there is a history or reasonable assurance of safety and minimal conflict between users.**

Comments 3-7, 9-11, 212-216: The reference to "dog owners" in **Policy RFA2** should be changed to "people with dogs" or something similar.

Response 3-10: Comment acknowledged. Change "~~dog owners~~" in **Policy RFA2** to "people with dogs"

Comments 3-253,254: Concerned about increasing restriction of dogs, as at Albany Beach.

Response 3-11: Albany beach is part of the Eastshore State Park, managed by the District. The state's policy prohibits dogs on the beach. This was a major issue, which was thoroughly debated in the State Park's General Plan review process. The Regional Park District is not increasing restrictions on dogs. See comments and responses which follow.

Comments 3-167-207, -233-262: The District should provide more off-leash access to people with dogs.

Comments 3-8,155-166: Dogs running off-leash often create safety concerns and conflicts with other users as well as with wildlife and natural resources. There needs to be better education and more pro-active consideration and cooperation by dog-walkers.

Response 3-12: Dogs are allowed to run off-leash in most regional parks and on most trails. The few exceptions, in environmentally sensitive areas and areas of high public use or potential conflict with other park users, are called out in the Park Rules and Regulations, Ordinance 38. This Master Plan in **Policies RFA2 and RFA3**, recognizes that dog walking and canine recreation are an important activity in the regional parks, but also that dogs may cause conflicts in restricted or high-use areas and should be regulated accordingly. The park-user surveys carried out in preparing this Master Plan show strong support for leash regulations in some or

all park areas. The Master Plan sets the Board's policy standards for dogs, bicyclists and other trail users. Individual park plans and Ordinance 38 will continue to interpret and carry out this policy in specific locations.

Comments 3-20-30.: Dog walkers should be specifically acknowledged as a user group and included in **Policy RFA3**, pertaining to narrow trails.

Response 3-13: Amend **Policy RFA3** to include "people with dogs" on narrow trails.

Comments 3-273-276, -288: Increased use of trails by other user groups (horses, dog walkers) limits equestrian options. Horses and bikes together on narrow trails create conflicts and safety hazards. Need more dedicated equestrian trails.

Comments 3-283,-284, -286, -287: Don't expand equestrian trails. Provide separate hiking and equestrian trails.

Response 3-14: Please see text above, under Comment 4-64:

Where feasible, the District will provide multi-use opportunities on trails within the same trail corridor. Bicycling and equestrian paths will be separate wherever possible, although they may share a common corridor.

Comments 3-152, -154, -290, -291, -298,: The District's trail policy should include the disabled as trail users. The District should consider allowing horse-drawn carts on trails to accommodate the elderly and disabled.

Response 3-15: The District does have an accessible facilities plan (Self-Evaluation and Transition Plan), and is beginning to evaluate trails in terms of surface condition and grade. With regard to horse carts and wagons, interesting comment noted; however, implementing this suggestion could be done through amending Ordinance 38, and would not require a Master Plan policy change. Please see also, comment and response on "Power Assisted Mobility Devices" at Chapter 4, Comment 4-64.

Comment 3-547: The Board should consider converting some non-essential fire roads to a narrower trail standard for multi-use.

Response 3-16: Comment acknowledged. Revise the second sentence of the second paragraph under "Dedicated and Shared Use narrow Trails" (p. 47) to say:

In keeping with the District interest in providing trails for all, the development of narrow trails open to bike riding, including the selective narrowing of existing wide ranch roads and fire trails, will be considered on a park-by-park basis in the land use plan process.

Children's Play Areas

Comments 3-612-615: The District should expand its children's programs and youth activities, including volunteer programs, mountain biking and trail maintenance.

Response 3-17: Comments noted. Please see numerous references to youth activities in Master plan text, including changing demographics, youth trends and “Healthy Parks, Healthy People” (pp. 13-15), camping and day camps (p. 57, 121), the Campership Program (p. 47, 117), and Policies PA2 and PS2.

CHAPTER 4 – PLANNING AND ACQUISITION

Public Participation

Comment 4-1: The District should include plans and designs for major facilities in its public notification and review process.

Response 4-1: Comment acknowledged. Amend Policy KEP I to read:

- ▶ **KEP I: The District will notify the public about the publication of plans, including proposed design of major new facilities, and the scheduled times for public review and comment.**

Environmental Compliance

Comments 4-67, -69: The Master Plan should be reviewed under CEQA.

Response 4-2: The Master Plan is a broad policy document, and is not a “Project” under CEQA. CEQA defines a project as an action “*which has a potential for resulting in either a direct physical change in the environment, or a reasonably foreseeable indirect physical change in the environment...*” (CEQA Guidelines, sec.15378). If this is not the case, the action is exempt from CEQA review (sec. 15061(b)(3)). The only potential action described in the Master Plan is the potential future acquisition of parkland, which is described in the most general terms of acquisition goals. In this sense, the Master Plan is the equivalent of a “feasibility or planning study” for possible future acquisition actions, the effects of which would be too speculative to analyze at this time, and which would be exempt from CEQA under sec. 15262. Furthermore, the District acquires property for the purposes of environmental protection and stewardship, not development (see the Master Plan’s Mission and Vision statements). Land acquisition is specifically exempt from CEQA if its primary purpose is to protect natural resources and the environment (secs.15307 and 15308), provide land for wildlife conservation (sec. 15313) or to create parks and open space contracts or easements (secs.15316 and 15317). Finally, the District commits, in Policy KEP-2, to review all specific land use plans and development “projects” which do meet the definition under CEQA when those plans and projects are specific enough to review their potential environmental impacts.

Resource Protection and Recreational Use Analysis

- ▶ **KEP3: The District will identify the important resources in parklands and develop recommendations for protecting them. The park planning process will consider the needs of potential park users along with resource protection recommendations to minimize the impact to identified resources or if necessary, to mitigate for this impact.**

Comment 4-3-6: The reference to minimizing impact to resources should be changed to “avoid”).

Response 4-3: Reference to avoiding, minimizing and mitigating impacts is standard language taken from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). While it is always preferable to avoid any environmental impact, it is not always possible. In these cases, minimizing or mitigating impacts must be considered. No revision is necessary.

Land Bank

- ▶ **ACQ3: The District will hold acquisitions in land bank status until the property is suitable for public access.**

Comment 4-9: Acquire property and leave wild or w/minimal hiking.

Comment 4-10: Don't buy more property until existing properties can be maintained safely. Prioritize development of existing facilities over development of new ones.

Comment 4-18: Habitat preservation and protection of sensitive and rare species should be #1 priority in Acquisition and Land Management.

Comment 4-19: Good to buy land when have opportunity and o.k. to leave in land bank until it's financially prudent to open it to the public.

Comment 4-56-62: Land banked property should be opened for hiking sooner, perhaps by permit, to recognized hiking groups.

Response 4-4: Many of the newly acquired properties come with various legal and conservation restrictions, and must be planned accordingly. In order to open parkland to the public, the District must be able to assure its safety to park users, resource protection, adequate staffing and facilities, including public safety and emergency response, and reasonable access and parking which addresses any local concerns. For this reason, the Master Plan outlines an extensive planning and public review process in order to discover and address issues of the development and management of parkland for public use. (Please see the section which follows: **Planning for Regional Parks and Trails**.)

Regional Trails

Comment 4-30-35: The District should follow International Mountain Biking Association (IMBA) guidelines in designing trails, and should provide at least one IMBA-certified trail circuit in every park. The District should also consider opportunities for mountain bike skills parks at places like Marciel Gate in Anthony Chabot.

Response 4-5: The District will add a reference to design to the existing text under "Dedicated and Shared Use Narrow Trails" on p. 47 to recognize the unique requirements of designing narrow trails for mountain biking:

There is a growing interest in the East Bay for the use of narrow trails by bike riders. In keeping with the District interest in providing trails for all, the design and development

of narrow trails dedicated to bike riding will be considered on a park-by-park basis in the Land Use Plan process.

Comments 4-96-98: Continue to promote and develop links between regional parks and urban areas for bicycles.

Response 4-6: Please see text under “Regional Trail” on p. 75:

Regional Trails provide multiple use, pedestrian, equestrian and bicycling connections between District parks, thus encouraging alternative modes of transportation and helping to reduce pollution. They also link District parks with other local parks, open spaces, trails, transportation and employment centers and urban communities.

Planning and Management Guidelines for Recreation/Staging Units

Comment 4-64: In reference to the new state law creating an exception allowing disabled people to use power driven mobility devices on non-motorized trails, the District’s Board should more closely define “Power-Driven Mobility Device.”

Response 4-7: Comment acknowledged. Revise the text under the 5th bullet on p. 92 to read:

Where feasible, the District will provide multi-use opportunities on ~~Regional~~ trails within the same trail corridor. Bicycling and equestrian paths will be separate wherever possible, although they may share a common corridor. ~~Regional~~ Trails should be wide enough to accommodate designated users. The use of motorized vehicles is prohibited on Regional Trails unless they conform to the Board approved definition of a “Power- Driven Mobility Device” used by a person with impaired mobility as delineated in the **Interim Policy on the Use of Other Power-Driven Mobility Devices**, which Policy shall be consistent with the applicable provisions of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Also, add a reference to the **Interim Policy on the Use of Other Power-Driven Mobility Devices** to the list of adopted board policies in Appendix I.

Facility Development

Comment 4-8: PRPT 28 and 29 restrict the future installation of infrastructure such as utility lines or communications facilities on District lands. A majority of the PAC requests the Board consider the unintended consequences resulting from a policy that might exclude new technology which could be beneficial to the District.

Response 4-8: Policies PRPT 28 and 29 refer to existing technologies and cannot anticipate technologies that have not yet been developed. Therefore, these policies are adequate at this time but may need to be revised in the future as new technologies are developed.

CHAPTER 5 HUMAN AND FINANCIAL RESOURCES

Comment 5-1: Revise Policy PS2 as follows, "... and conservation agencies, resource science, and community groups."

Response 5-1: The proposed revision makes no substantial difference in the meaning of the policy.

Comment 5-3: Don't delete volunteer language from Master Plan

Response 5-2: Volunteers covered in Policy HR3.

Comment 5-38-79: We need an advisory board with Native voices. Please respect Native land. Listen to Native voices.

Response 5-3: Please see response to comment 2-21.

Chapter 1 Related Comments: Mission, Vision, Priorities and Process

No.	Comment	Response/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
1-1	You should not have to log in to view online MP comments	Noted			9-Oct
1-2	P. 13 line 10 "...unique recreational experiences like hiking, horseback riding, and fishing..." Comment: These activities can be experienced at State and National parks, some city parks and at private stables and preserves. These activities are not unique to regional parks. I suggest re-evaluating the concept that is trying to be conveyed in this section.	Response 1-1	Amy	Arcus	17-Oct
1-3	Is not addressed until the Priorities Section and then is only as the 5th in the list. Acknowledge this issue with a statement in the 12 bullet section addressing the District's strategies for achieving its vision	Response 1-2	Regional Parks	Association	21-Sep
1-4	The EBRPD preserves a rich will continue its heritage of preserving natural and cultural resources, consisting of and provides open space, parks, trails, open space and programs safe and healthful recreation and environmental education. An and with the guidance of an environmental ethic, will provide opportunities for healthful recreation and environmental education guides the District in all of its activities.	Response 1-3	Amy	Arcus	17-Oct
1-5	says provides "safe open space". Maybe the phrase "law abiding" is better because it doesn't imply a person is safe from rattle snakes, poison oak, head exhaustion, etc.	Response 1-4	San Ramon	Valley Horse	19-Sep
1-6	Move Bullet #6 (Balanced environmental concerns and recreation... up to be bullet #4	Response 1-5	Regional Parks	Association	21-Sep
1-7	Ways to achieve vision plan: last bullet says Pursue all appropriate activities to ensure the fiscal health..... This could mean races and franchises. We recommend adding the phrase "without compromising natural resource protection nor lessening the enjoyment of the park experience for park users not involved in those activities"	Response 1-6	Regional Parks	Association	21-Sep
1-8	"... open space parkland in Alameda and Contra Costa counties, which will forever provide geographically close and fair share access the opportunity for a growing and diverse community to experience nature well into the foreseeable future nearby.	Response 1-7	Amy	Arcus	17-Oct
1-9	3rd bullet: Interpret the parklands by focusing educational programs on the visitor's relationship to nature, natural recreational processes, ecology, the value of natural conditions and the history of the parklands.	Response 1-8	Amy	Arcus	17-Oct
1-10	7th bullet: Provide recreational development that fosters appropriate use of parklands while preserving their remoteness and intrinsic value. Comment is to change the wording because preserving their intrinsic value would seem to include the issue of appropriate use.	Response 1-9	Amy	Arcus	17-Oct
1-11	Your proposed policy is perfect, stick to your goals!	Response 1-10	Marilyn	Russell	11-Sep
1-12	EBRPD not following standard and widely-accepted M.P. Process	Noted	Sioux	Messinger	12-Sep
1-13	Good job	Response 1-10	Kevin	Cabral	19-Sep
1-14	Tabs in Master Plan	Noted			19-Sep
1-15	Park District Great!	Response 1-10			19-Sep
1-16	Board and Staff doing a terrific job, continue in the current direction. Great work, all and thank you	Response 1-10	Denise	Blackman	29-Sep
1-17	Overall, I agree with and support the identified changes in to M.P. Implementation, should prioritize conservation over human uses	Response 1-10	Jo Ann	Lew	29-Sep
1-18	Revise all-users language to clarify that use consistent w/EBRPD's mission and vision (to preserve, protect, etc.) i.e. non-motorized low impact use with exception of handicap access and patrol by staff.	Noted			3-Oct
1-19	I appreciate the format for this process	Response 1-10			3-Oct
1-20	Page 7, District takes place of Ala/CCA rec., but other counties to provide for OHV	Noted			3-Oct
1-21	Page 19 re: partnerships. Has District approach OHV community or P&R com about partnerships	Noted			3-Oct
1-22	Thank you for the presentation and opportunity to comment in this forum.	Response 1-10	Citizen		9-Oct
1-23	Under we are more diverse: African Americans are omitted and in Alameda Co. they are 13% of Population and in CCC are 9% of the population	Response 1-11	Robert Raburn	BART	26-Sep
1-24	The Special Role of Regional Parks. Politically defined.. (just put a space between parks and politically)	Noted	CNPS		21-Nov
1-25	...preserve water resources, native plant and wildlife habitat,	Response 1-12	CNPS		21-Nov
1-26The large amount of natural habitat... supports a healthy native ecosystems for of plants and wildlife.	Response 1-13			
1-27	Support adding environmental education to Mission and should include source of water sup. And how people share water w/nature and the Delta. Teaching the nat. his. Through the parks and trails is important	Response 1-10			3-Oct
1-28	I support the proposed mission	Response 1-10			11-Sep
1-29	Incorporate sustainable local agriculture in the mission	Response 1-14			11-Sep
1-30	More opportunities to get to the parks without cars for low income, urban people.	Response 1-15			11-Sep
1-31	Public outreach to involve communities that do not traditionally support the District in the District's shared future.	Response 1-16			11-Sep
1-32	Very aggressively target "new" and "underserved" communities so they know the parks are there and theirs	Response 1-16			11-Sep
1-33	Likes the last sentence in the Mission Statement about environmental ethics	Response 1-10			19-Sep
1-34	What will District do to ensure the survey methods used to assess constituent's interests are scientifically valid	Response 1-17			19-Sep
1-35	Phone and on-line surveys were skewed and do not accurately reflect diversity of recreational users. Calls into question applicability and weight of consideration	Response 1-17			29-Sep
1-36	Add a statement on safety to the Vision statement	Response 1-18			3-Oct

Chapter 2 Related Comments: Cultural/Natural Resource Management, Stewardship

No.	Comment	Response/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
2-1	Wording to be amended in CR policies to accurately reflect native American values and experience	Response 2-19			19-Sep
2-2	CRM should have on-going representation of Native American perspective in District decisions	Response 2-21			19-Sep
2-3	More powerful language to empower native people, presence of contemporary Native culture	Response 2-19			11-Sep
2-4	Severly inadequate, Native Americans should be consulted and listened to.	Noted			11-Sep
2-5	CRM1: The District will manage, conserve and when practical restore parkland cultural and historic resources and sites with local Native American communities, to preserve the heritage of the people who continue to inhabit occupied this land before the District was established.	Response 2-19	Sioux	Messinger	12-Sep
2-6	CRM1 language too vague doesn't specify process for including native peoples in discussion of MP and accommodations sought as a result	Response 2-22			9-Oct
2-7	The District will manage, conserve and when practical restore parkland cultural and historic resources and sites <u>with local Native American communities</u> , to preserve the heritage of the people who <u>continue to inhabit occupied this land before the District was established</u> .	Response 2-19	Chain Letter	78	
2-8	CRM2 - District should acquire/control Tesla, perhaps in conjunction with the State, to protect the resources	Noted			22-Sep
2-9	CRM4: The District Native American communities will determine the level of public access to their cultural and historic resources. <u>Using procedures and practices adopted by the Board of Directors</u> . The District will research the practices being employed and generally accepted as best management practices by State and Federal Parks and SB18 to minimize the impact of public use and access on these resources, and to appropriately interpret the significance of these resources on a	Response 2-20	Sioux	Messinger	12-Sep
2-10	The District <u>Local Native American communities</u> will determine the level of public access to <u>their</u> cultural and historic resources <u>using procedures and practices adopted by the Board of Directors</u> . The District will <u>research the practices being employed and generally accepted as best management practices by State and Federal Parks and SB18 to minimize the impact of public use and access on these resources, and to appropriately interpret the significance of these resources on a</u>	Response 2-20	Chain Letter	78	
2-11	CRM5: The District will include Native American and other culturally associated peoples in discussions, at least 90 days prior to making any changes regarding the preservation and land use planning of sites and landscapes significant to their culture.	Response 2-22	Sioux	Messinger	12-Sep
2-12	The District will include Native American and other culturally associated peoples in discussions, <u>at least 90 days prior to making any changes</u> regarding the preservation and land use planning of sites and landscapes significant to their culture.	Response 2-22	Chain Letter	78	
2-13	Change policy to include indigenous voice on equal footing	Response 2-23	Indian	People Organization	11-Sep
2-14	Policy is not adequate i.e. "try to accommodate" or putting Natives in same importance as ranching.	Response 2-23	Dylan	Cooke	11-Sep
2-15	Not adequate, needs to be more specific, must have focus meetings with Native Americans	Response 2-22	George	Cammarota	11-Sep
2-16	The policy is severly inadequate, should revise according to guidelines put forward by indigenous people	Response 2-22	Maria	Lewis	11-Sep
2-17	CRM6: The District will <u>try to accommodate</u>	Response 2-23	Sioux	Messinger	12-Sep
2-18	The District will try to accommodate requests by historic groups, <u>local</u> Native Americans, and other culturally affiliated groups to maintain and use cultural sites and to play an active role in their preservation and interpretation.	Response 2-19 and 2-23	Chain Letter	78	
2-19	Recommend adding a new policy NRM12: Potable water is provided by several water agencies for human consumption and other purposes. The District will seek to reduce the consumption of imported potable water through conservation efforts and through developing other sources of water for irrigation and non-potable	Response 2-18	PAC		
2-20	Similar language should be adopted into the Natural Resource management component of the plan, as what the EBRPD defines as natural often has cultural significance to Native peoples. EBRPD should commit to convening an advisory board of local indigenous people to oversee the decision-making that pertains to their	Response 2-21	Chain Letter	78	
2-21	Don't like watered down version. "will work toward minimizing" should stay "will minimize"	Noted	Elisabeth	Heidorn	11-Sep
2-22	NRM1 concept of conservation maintenance and management in this policy needs to be led by native peoples depending on area/clan. District idea of these concepts may be contrary to indigenous concepts of conservation, protection and management.	Response 2-5			9-Oct
2-23	Why are native species such as coyote brush and poison oak considered invasive. Natives and Non natives should be distinguished	Response 2-13			11-Sep
2-24	...sensitive plant species and their habitats; <u>to promote and restore, where appropriate, native plant communities; and where possible....</u>	Response 2-8	PAC		
2-25	The District will maintain and manage vegetation to conserve, enhance and restore natural <u>native</u> plant communities; <u>as well as</u> to preserve Achieve a high representation of native plants and animals. <u>The District will map its significant native vegetation resources and develop management plans for them. Comment JR1 'natural' is too soft of a word. That type of language needs to be clarified to mean native plants and plant communities are what we are trying to protect, conserve, encourage, re-establish.</u>	Response 2-8	CNPS		21-Nov
2-26	Why has language on firebreaks and fuel management been stricken.	Noted			11-Sep
2-27	Clearer language regarding treatment of invasive species minimize or remove	Response 2-9			11-Sep
2-28	Is coyote brush invasive or native?	Response 2-13			11-Sep
2-29	Shrubland or woodland = native plants? Native habitat values should be weighed	Response 2-9			11-Sep
2-30	Surprised by wording under Natural Resource Management "minimizing the widespread encroachment.... Coyote brush poison oak and broom.	Response 2-13	Sue	Duckles	11-Sep
2-31	The District will evaluate <u>exotic</u> eucalyptus, pine and cypress plantations, shrubland.... <u>fire-prone condition, that is conducive to native plant communities, following the methods....encroachment of exotic</u> invasive species such as coyote brush, poison oak and broom, pampas grass, teasel, Himalayan blackberry, etc on parkland.	Response 2-9 and 2-13		CNPS	21-Nov

Chapter 2 Related Comments: Cultural/Natural Resource Management, Stewardship

No.	Comment	Response/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
2-32	Comments JR2 and JR3: We know that some indigenous conifer species do exist in Alameda and CC counties, such as knobcone pine, coulter pine, gray pine and sargent cypress (not necessarily in the exotic 'plantation' areas). We would like to see these indigenous species existing on district lands mapped and protected (see NRM5). JR3: We know that coyote brush is a pioneer species and as such, has real value on some degraded and highly disturbed sites. It also provides important food and cover for insects and birds. Poison oak, inconvenient at times for people, and a safety issue as well on some sites, is also a great habitat plant that provides food and cover for wildlife, as well as being a champion stabilizer of loose and erosion prone soils. The native plant society is not in agreement that baccharis and poison oak should be singled out as 'invasive species' that should be 'minimized' on parklands willy nilly. Areas of widespread 'encroachment' of coyote brush and p. oak can be monitored and evaluated on a case by case basis, when issues of public safety and access are paramount, or when encroachment of these species are crowding out other more valuable native habitats such as managed native coastal prairie. Wholesale removal (or minimization) of coyote brush and poison oak (as a stated policy) is not an educated approach to land management.	Response 2-13		CNPS	21-Nov
2-33		Noted		CNPS	21-Nov
2-34	...viable wildlife populations within balanced native ecosystems....	Response 2-17		CNPS	21-Nov
2-35 the District will take steps to restore it, using native or naturalized plants adapted...	Response 2-15		CNPS	21-Nov
2-36	Add to RM1: "when access "by livestock grazing negatively impacts resources...."	Response 2-2			22-Sep
2-37	RM1 "negatively impacted by the public" add "livestock" and other damageers of trails	Response 2-2			22-Sep
2-38	There is not mention of the role of biological research to support goal to "monitor their health and viability"	Response 2-1			11-Sep
2-39	Second sentence "When access to park areas by the public or by livestock grazing is negatively impacting those resources....."	Response 2-2	Regional Parks	Association	21-Sep
2-40	Rotate designated trails and trails that get heavy impact	Noted		EB Dog Alliance	11-Sep
2-41	CNPS suggests adding the following directly under Veg Mgmt heading: The flora of California is incredibly diverse and unique, with a third of its more than 6,000 native plant species occurring nowhere else in the world. The complex and interwoven relationships between native plant communities and our climate and soils, and between native plants and the native insects, birds, amphibians, reptiles, mammals, and other life forms, have evolved over the centuries and millennia. So much of the diversity, beauty, wonder, abundance of life, and sense of place that we appreciate in the parks springs out of the native plant life. The Park District is the largest steward of publicly held land in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. As such, the District's role in managing vegetation for preserving and improving the native habitat values is key to the health and biodiversity of these important publicly owned treasures.	Response 2-7		CNPS	21-Nov
2-42	CNPS suggests the following changes under Veg Mgmt heading:adaptive management techniques to <u>favor native vegetation where possible, while simultaneously achieving maintain a balance between native and non-native vegetation and to achieve</u> wildland fuel and invasive...	Response 2-7		CNPS	21-Nov
2-43	CNPS suggests: Examples include groves of <u>exotic</u> eucalyptus, pine.... Line of defense against wildfire, <u>while simultaneously planning for and creating opportunities for recolonization by less fuel intensive native plant associations.</u> In the Park Planning process....	Response 2-7		CNPS	21-Nov
2-44	CNPS suggests: Interior park vegetation... not generally managed except for the purpose of encouraging more native and natural plant communities.	Response 2-7		CNPS	21-Nov
2-45	<u>Native</u> Grassland areas should be preserved and in some cases re-established.... and in most <u>some</u> cases will require ongoing grazing...strategies to control brush invasion, <u>where necessary.</u>	Response 2-7		CNPS	21-Nov
2-46	Management of <u>exotic</u> eucalyptus and pine plantations....	Response 2-7		CNPS	21-Nov
2-47	Research has demonstrated that active managementprescribed burning programs, <u>carried out as specific and key times of the year, depending upon the species being managed,</u> can be effective..... Comment JR4: The Native Plant Society is not a fan of disking, as it tends to create a welcoming seed bed for the intrusion and establishment of weedy exotics, that then need repeated treatment year after year. Certain valuable ongoing restoration projects have been abandoned, in fact, due to the nearby continual re-invasion of weeds from disking. These 'resource management methods' (disking, using machinery to 'crush and uproot', use of ATV's) may reduce fire risk in the short run but they are certainly not good long term effective fuels management strategies that support stable eco-systems and native habitat values. Rather, the use of these methods leave soil disturbed, compacted, sometimes more erosion prone, and ready for weeds.	Response 2-14		CNPS	21-Nov
2-48	Terrestrial Wildlife: ... adapted to the California landscape, and climate <u>and native flora.</u> The district manages....	Noted		CNPS	21-Nov
2-49	District needs a public art policy	Noted			29-Sep
2-50	Leave large piles of excrement which is unsightly, attracts flies and can pollute the soil and water bodies with parasitocidal chemicals, antibiotics and other chemicals	Response 2-2	Amy	Arcus	17-Oct
2-51	Cattle tear up trails in the winter	Noted			29-Sep
2-52	Livestock -- a resource and aesthetic issue	Response 2-2	Beverly	Lane	9-Oct
2-53	Problematic, they leave pock-marked rutte trails which can be hazardous	Noted	Amy	Arcus	17-Oct
2-54	Limit use of chemicals to last resort	Noted	Jo Ann	Lew	29-Sep
2-55	Plan by professional trained in this area	Noted			11-Sep
2-56	Preserve cultural and historic resources e.g. barns, corals, buildings, windmills	Response 2-19			11-Sep
2-57	Try to accommodate (triangle?) will establish a mechanism by which culturally affiliated groups can partner with /EBRPD	Response 2-22 and 2-23			11-Sep

Chapter 2 Related Comments: Cultural/Natural Resource Management, Stewardship

No.	Comment	Response/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
2-58	Would like the cultural resource manager be a native person	Noted			19-Sep
2-59	Continue to protect culturally sensitive sites	Response 2-19			29-Sep
2-60	Support funding for a cultural resources planning position on staff	Noted			9-Oct
2-61	Remove public use from culturally significant sites	Response 2-20			9-Oct
2-62	New cultural resources staff should be Indian	Noted	Beverly	Lane	9-Oct
2-63	Repurpose land being grazed by cattle to deer or elk farming because they graze in a way to enhance native flora.	Noted	Julie	Bongers	11-Sep
2-64	Support political candidates that support environmental presevation	Noted	Pelagio	Borrega	22-Sep
2-65	Encourage long term solution for environmental preservation, plant trees in watershed areas, proper waste disposals, etc.	Noted	Pelagio	Borrega	22-Sep
2-66	I hope you continue to consider and use when possible, environmental practices being modeled around the planet to accelerate the scope of net-positive results for Bay Area (and ultimately, global) ecosystems and inhabitants, and to expand partnerships for watershed restoration and food localization projects to build community resilience and self-reliance.	Noted	Amy	Coulter	31-Oct
2-67	Concerned about wildland fire safety , especially in parks bordering residential areas. Continue to manage for fire safety.	Response 2-9	Diablo Fire	Safe Council	11-Sep
2-68	Prefer controlled burns over goat grazing to ensure native seed continue to flourish.	Response 2-14	Julie	Bongers	11-Sep
2-69	This decade is a critical time for us to do something about the environmental and social consequences of humans' fossil-fuel consumption and associated carbon footprint.	Noted	Amy	Coulter	31-Oct
2-70	M.P. updated is defined as a project under CEQA language and request District submit Env. Application/EIR . Many policies directly and indirectly impact natural and cultural resources.	Noted			3-Oct
2-71	M.P. update is defined as a project under CEQA law and request EBRPD submit environ. Application review. Many aspects directly & indirectly impact Native American cultural resources.	Noted			3-Oct
2-72	MP update is defined as a project under CEQA. Request EBRPD submit environmental application/EIR. Many policies directly and indirectly impact Native American cultural resources	Noted			3-Oct
2-73	Master Plan Policy around meaningful consultation with indigenous people needs to include concrete procedures to this effect	Response 2-22	Michelle	Steinberg	11-Sep
2-74	Tighten up language, too vague regarding consultation w/native people: SB Equal partners, Teachings Dictate Relationship w/land	Response 2-22			11-Sep
2-75	Language is not specific enough. Need to be more specific when defining how local native peoples will be involved in the cultural preservatin of their cultural resources. Create an advisory board of local indiginous people	Response 2-21 and 2-22			
2-76	Should have primary leadership in developing park policy	Noted	Louise	Dunlap	11-Sep
2-77	Keep sacred spaces protected	Response 2-20	William	Sonne	9-Oct
2-78	Should have primary influence on policy and access to sacred sites	Noted			11-Sep
2-79	First American rights, see BLM, Forest Service regarding sacred sites	Response 2-20			11-Sep
2-80	More input protecting sacred sites	Response 2-22	Larry	Aguilers	11-Sep
2-81	Respect the voices of Native peoples. Respect sacred sites	Response 2-22	Autumn	Belnap	11-Sep
2-82	More access to sacred sites	Response 2-19			11-Sep
2-83	Inclusion of advisory board of indigenous to oversee the decisions pertaining to sacred places	Response 2-21	Sioux	Messinger	12-Sep
2-84	Include local native people in correcting and further processing the cultural resource mgmt section of the M.P.	Response 2-22	Julie	Hernandez	19-Sep
2-85	We are in support of religeous rights for Ohlone and Miwok to practice ceremonies and protect their sacred sites	Response 2-19	Sarah		9-Oct
2-86	Here to support the Ohlone to protect their sacred land from further disturbance	Noted	Grace		9-Oct
2-87	Concrened EBRPD is going to continue desecrating native people's sacred sites. The genocide has been relentless since Columbus landed, and EBRPD continues this legacy of destruction in new ways. Destroying sacred sites is cultural genocide. Ignoring native voices is colonial. Excluding native people is racist and imperialist. Change the legacy, respect native voices	Response 2-22	Alec		9-Oct
2-88	Thank you for the work on this plan. Need to be more specific in regard to "cultural resources". It is very important to specify the preservation of Native American sacred sites. This is our indeginous community, we value them highly in Richmond	Response 2-20	Mayor	McLaughlin	9-Oct
2-89	Set aside Brushy Peak most sacred site to Ohlone, Miwok for spiritual ceremonies only. I support their wishes to be able to do ceremonies and protect site - Native American Religious Freedom act	Noted	Citizen		9-Oct
2-90	Respect native voices, don't develop sacred sites, limit access to sacred sites, acknowledge the violent acquisition of park land/the whole area	Response 2-22	Billy		9-Oct
2-91	Work with counties to prevent development on native and sacred sites	Noted			9-Oct
2-92	Implement a professional development training created by indigenous people on desecration of sacred sites	Response 2-22			9-Oct
2-93	Create a policy to allow use by native peoples to perform ceremonies at sites sacred to them. Ceremonies should be private by request	Response 2-19			9-Oct
2-94	Any area that native tribes, federally recognized or not, claim to be sacred space should be left alone untouched & undeveloped	Noted			9-Oct
2-95	Implement professional development on sacred site desecration led by indigenous people	Response 2-22			9-Oct
2-96	Prioritize sacred sites not to be owned or possessed, not as a cultural resource but as historical monument	Noted			9-Oct
2-97	Implement professional development on sacred site desecration led by indigenous people	Response 2-22			9-Oct
2-98	Native Americans must be equal partners in management of sacred sites and cultural resources	Response 2-22	Hillary	Lehr	9-Oct
2-99	Respect Native viewpoint when it comes to managing their sacred sites. You built a recreation area over Brushy Peak!	Response 2-22	Billy	Trice	25-Oct
2-100	Different strata from ranchers	Response 2-20			11-Sep

Chapter 2 Related Comments: Cultural/Natural Resource Management, Stewardship

No.	Comment	Response/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
2-101	Land is our identity, our creation stories come from it, our means to culturally survive, our spirituality is relative to place	Response 2-19	Laura	Cedillo	11-Sep
2-102	Preserve and honor ancestral stories, access to sites for ceremonies, interpretive info and signage re history	Response 2-19			11-Sep
2-103	Include in Cultural Resource Mgmt Plan voice on equal footing this is our historical land	Response 2-19	Indian People	Organizing for Change	11-Sep
2-104	Consult native people for accurate information, Native Children in the area need this to develop their identities.	Response 2-22	Native American	Health Center	11-Sep
2-105	Support native American access rights	Response 2-19	Pamela	Richard	19-Sep
2-106	I'm supporting the revisions for Native American access rights, being submitted by Native American groups in the SF Bay Area	Response 2-20	Pamela	Richard	19-Sep
2-107	Supports putting a face on Native Americans to increase sensitivity to their cultural heritage	Response 2-22			22-Sep
2-108	Continue to develop sensitivity to Native American heritage and values	Response 2-22			29-Sep
2-109	District should sit down with native american community to discuss cultural resource protection and policies	Response 2-22			3-Oct
2-110	Encourage recognition of the value of Native American cultural resources and preserve their sites	Response 2-19			3-Oct
2-111	The District may not acquire native cultural and historic sites	Noted	Tom	Parp	9-Oct
2-112	Public access: be in full control of the tribes, recognized federally or not, and not in control of the District	Noted	Tom	Parp	9-Oct
2-113	As a native man what voice do I have in your planning. We are still here and in the present time, not just in the past. Give us a voice and a place to pray.	Response 2-19	Larry	Aquilera	9-Oct
2-114	Include local tribes representatives in all steps of your brainstorming, decision making and implementatin. You may disturb or violate sacred sites if you don't include knowledgeable Ohlones. Would like to see at least 1 indian person included in public presentations	Response 2-22	Nancy	Delaney	9-Oct
2-115	Please honor and respect the wishes of those whose land we inhabit	Response 2-22	Olivia		9-Oct
2-116	Should be a more diverse planning and presentation committee to represent the diverse community of the Bay Area. Native folks should be on Board and pre-existing parks deserve all this attention before moving into sacred spaces.	Response 2-22	Rosie		9-Oct
2-117	Local Ohlone and Bay Miwok people should be consulted about land acquisition. (2 people)	Response 2-22			9-Oct
2-118	District should be cutting edge in its partnerships with local indigenous groups and set an example for other park districts	Noted			9-Oct
2-119	Develop a native american intern program as a way to develop a more long-term relationship	Noted			9-Oct
2-120	Should be staff members who are indigenous people of the Bay Area	Noted			9-Oct
2-121	Consult w/appropriate native america groups prior to any development esp. of sensitive or sacred areas	Response 2-22			9-Oct
2-122	Include native voices when planning rec. areas	Response 2-22			9-Oct
2-123	Adopt Native American interest as defined recommded changes as submitted	Response 2-20			9-Oct
2-124	Native people should have control over culturally rich areas. Inclusion not enough	Noted			9-Oct
2-125	More active partnership between Board and local Ohlone including during public presentations, especially to preserve sacred sites and to respect people	Noted			9-Oct
2-126	Interpretive signs should include more native history from native sources.	Noted			9-Oct
2-127	EBRPD materials to explicitly recognize that EBRPD has control of decision making policy over native lands as a result of violent conquest & continuing genocide against native people	Noted			9-Oct
2-128	Recognize Native American interest to limit access to Vasco Caves	Noted			9-Oct
2-129	Increase Native American representation on the Board, staff and with policy discussions	Noted			9-Oct
2-130	Prioritize indigenous voices	Response 2-22			9-Oct
2-131	Local indigenous groups will determine level of public access	Noted			9-Oct
2-132	Separate Native Americans from special interest groups/stakeholders	Noted			9-Oct
2-133	Consult with Ohlone/Bay Miwok peoples	Response 2-20			9-Oct
2-134	Reflect with accuracy that new and current policies reflect contemporary cultures of Native Americans in urban and rural life	Noted			9-Oct
2-135	Ensure that tribal cultures are interpreted by true native/indigenous groups and clans of that specific area (6 people)	Noted			9-Oct
2-136	Review final policies to be approved by native voices (3 people)	Response 2-20			9-Oct
2-137	Directly include local indigenous peoples native to the area regardless of federal recognition directly as leadership in EBRPD decision making process (2 people)	Response 2-20			9-Oct
2-138	Should be a Native American review panel consulted at all points of MP visioning to implementation (3 people)	Response 2-21			9-Oct
2-139	Review process of electing Board so native peoples are definitely represented on the Board	Noted			9-Oct
2-140	All employees should receive anti-racism training and education in indigenous history of Bay Area (2 people)	Noted			9-Oct
2-141	Gives the indians what they want, you won't go wrong	Noted	Signe	Mattson	9-Oct
2-142	Give Ohlone a voice in EBRPD	Noted	Corrina	Gould	9-Oct
2-143	To support deeper commitment of collaboration w/native groups in MP	Response 2-22	Hillary	Lehr	9-Oct
2-144	Supporting native people	Noted	Kate	Gurney	9-Oct
2-145	Supporting the indigenous community	Noted	Saqib	Keval	9-Oct
2-146	Supporting the indigenous community	Noted	Vivian	Thorp	9-Oct
2-147	Please adopt the changes requested by indigenous people	Response 2-20	Katie	Lonche	9-Oct
2-148	Please adopt the changes requested by indigenous people	Noted	Dylan	Cooke	9-Oct

Chapter 2 Related Comments: Cultural/Natural Resource Management, Stewardship

No.	Comment	Response/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
2-149	Urge EBRPD to recognize that a more efficient and respectful process for working with local native communities is possible and necessary.	Noted	Hillary	Lehr	9-Oct
2-150	Stop trying to prevent natural succession from grassland to scrub. Pointless and requires polluting and dangerous prescribed burns and toxic herbicides. Unnatural methods are being used to prevent a natural process which is not sustainable.	Response 2-10			29-Sep
2-151	Quit destroying non-native trees. They are storing tons of carbon which will be released in the atmosphere as carbon dioxide when they are destroyed, contributing to climate change. They are not more flammable than the grassland and scrub which is native to California	Response 2-11			29-Sep
2-152	Agro & urban ecology partnerships to manage & use opportunistic species for uses such as herbal medicines, forage and construction materials	Response 2-12			11-Sep
2-153	Don't buy more land until you eliminate eucalyptus, broom, etc.	Response 2-11	Elisabeth	Heidorn	11-Sep
2-154	Native habitat values give us a sense of place	Noted			11-Sep
2-155	Re-introduce indigenous bulbs	Noted	Julie	Bongers	11-Sep
2-156	Web of life that relates to native plant values	Noted			11-Sep
2-157	Support the District controlling non-native plants and trees, particularly eucalyptus	Noted			19-Sep
2-158	Public access is important and necessary, but when/where should be informed by habitat preservation goals	Response 2-1			29-Sep
2-159	Concerned with non-compliance of users and natural resources	Noted			29-Sep
2-160	District should do more to monitor the status of natural resources and the effectiveness of its management policies. Share the results of this monitoring.	Response 2-4	Bill	Hunt	3-Oct
2-161	Preserving natural resources such as stands of wildflowers is important even if they are not rare, threatened or endangered species. Park visitors can derive great pleasures from seeing common species.	Noted	Bill	Hunt	3-Oct
2-162	The section of vegetation management seems too specific to the East Bay Hills	Response 2-6	Bill	Hunt	3-Oct
2-163	There are lots of valuable natural resources in addition to rare and threatened species	Noted			3-Oct
2-164	Actively evaluate very diverse, natural resources in proposed parks such as Tesla	Noted			3-Oct
2-165	Maintain as much open space in its natural condition	Noted	Jo Ann	Lew	29-Sep
2-166	Science informs the basis of good stewardship of the lands within the District. Is there adequate staffing to address those needs?	Noted			29-Sep
2-167	Think about additional funding for stewardship	Noted			3-Oct
2-168	Long term stewardship is essential priority	Noted			3-Oct
2-169	Collaborate with UC Berkeley forest pathology lab	Noted	Amelia	Marshall	11-Sep
2-170	Be more proactive in fighting SOD	Noted			11-Sep
2-171	Lake Anza is being misused in a way that is causing harm to natural resources	Noted			9-Oct
2-172	Re-plant trees from fuels management/eucalyptus removal	Response 2-16			29-Sep
2-173	Should be different policies, different vegetation management practices for different types of park habitat	Noted			3-Oct
2-174	Encourage native plants	Noted			9-Oct
2-175	Posted warnings of wild animals are seen before paid areas of facility	Noted	Jo Ann	Lew	29-Sep
2-176	An important wildlife corridor. Need to preserve enough land for animals to move in SE Alameda County	Noted			3-Oct

Chapter 3 Related Comments: Access, Interpretation, Recreation and Trails

No.	Comment	Response/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
3-1	The District will regularly use formal and informal survey methods <u>which provide information representative of park users.</u> to assess the interest of its constituents. This information	Response 3-1	Amy	Arcus	17-Oct
3-2	Add school districts to PA1 & partner with schools and parents on transportation to parks	Response 3-2			9-Oct
3-3	The District will use the concepts of the Healthy Parks / Healthy People movement to focus its outreach and education efforts, <u>and to help decide park use activities.</u> To achieve the goals of the Healthy Parks / Healthy People movement the District will partner with other.....	Response 3-3	Amy	Arcus	17-Oct
3-4	The District will cooperate with regional planning efforts to create more walkable and bike-able communities.....	Response 3-4	Amy	Arcus	17-Oct
3-5	The District will cooperate with <u>local and</u> regional planning efforts.....	Response 3-4	PAC		
3-6	PA 6&7: has there been an evaluation of ADA accessibility and an implementation plan?	Response 3-5	Advocate for PWDs	Frail & Elderly	19-Sep
3-7	RAF3 Dog owners are not listed as users of narrow trails	Response 3-10			29-Sep
3-8	Restrict dog access for safety. Dogs must be leashed	Response 3-12			11-Sep
3-9	Dog owners should be changed to people with dogs because dog walkers don't own the dogs	Response 3-10	Marla	Miyashiro	11-Sep
3-10	"dog owners" should be "people with dogs"	Response 3-10		EB Dog Alliance	11-Sep
3-11	Change RFA2 to People with Dogs or something similar	Response 3-10			11-Sep
3-12	RFA2: include native voices on trail construction access, re sacred site e.g. Brushy Peak insufficient signage	Response 3-8			9-Oct
3-13	RFA2 Change to people walking dogs	Noted	Barnsdale	& Yoshikawa, et al	9-Oct
3-14as appropriate, based on location, recreational intensity, environmental, <u>public health</u> and safety considerations.	Noted	Amy	Arcus	17-Oct
3-15	Add the sentence: Narrow trails specifically designed for bicyclists and designated as single or multiple use trails will be added to parks in appropriate areas.	Response 3-9	Amy	Arcus	17-Oct
3-16	Many trails already too unsafe and unpleasant to hike and walk on due to large numbers of off-leash dogs and aggressive mountain bikers. The main intent of the policy change appears to weaken the existing safety oriented policy prohibiting bikes from narrow trails. No such thing as a safe multi-use trail once off-leash dogs and bikes are permitted. Show some consideration for those who simply like to take a safe and enjoyable walk in the parks and restrict bikes and dogs to a reduced number of clearly designated areas. Those users can still visit the rest of the trails without their bikes and dogs.	Response 3-9	Steve	Luzmoor	31-Oct
3-17	Education on trail use, especially dog owners and bicyclists	Response 3-9			11-Sep
3-18	Amend RFA2 and RFA3 to say people with dogs	Response 3-9	Marla	Miyashiro	11-Sep
3-19	Want ordinance 38 to reflect RFA2 & 3 allow on narrow trails for mt bikers	Response 3-9			9-Oct
3-20	New trails should also include people with dogs and joggers	Response 3-13		EB Dog Alliance	11-Sep
3-21	Add people with dogs to RFA3	Response 3-13			11-Sep
3-22	Amend RFA3 to people with dogs to its list of users for whom trails will be added.	Response 3-13	Marla	Miyashiro	11-Sep
3-23	List dog walkers specifically as narrow trail users	Response 3-13			9-Oct
3-24	RFA3 does not include dogs under narrow trail users	Response 3-13			11-Sep
3-25	Narrow trails to include people with dogs (RFA3)	Response 3-13			9-Oct
3-26	RFA3 add people with dogs as a user group	Response 3-13			19-Sep
3-27	RFA 3 should include dog owners in the list of users on the new trails	Response 3-13	Keith	McAllister	29-Sep
3-28	RFA3 should include dog owners in language of policy	Response 3-13			9-Oct
3-29	Include people walking dogs in RFA3	Response 3-13			9-Oct
3-30	You omitted people walking dogs as a user group for new trails, worried about attrition over time if dogs are not mentioned in the policy	Response 3-13	Barnsdale	& Yoshikawa, et al	9-Oct
3-31	Lists a singularly unique Marksmanship Range in Anthony Chabot, PAC questions whether this remains consistent with the District's Mission and Vision and whether it should continue as a use on District lands.	Noted	PAC		
3-32	Identify park areas to plant fruit or nut trees to generate revenues and jobs and provide food	Response 3-6	Pelagio	Borrega	22-Sep
3-33	Opportunities for agrarian and animal husbandry experience like farm at Ardenwood in the East County	Response 3-6			22-Sep
3-34	Maintain agricultural heritage of region (grow crops, community garden)	Response 3-6			22-Sep
3-35	CA nursery park (community gardening). Historical contribution - develop ed/interp. Keep on radar even for developing land	Response 3-6			29-Sep
3-36	Preserve agriculture	Response 3-6	Eileen & John	Hofstandt	22-Sep
3-37	Improvements re: additional contact with animals, petting zoo, etc.	Response 3-6			29-Sep
3-38	Bikes only trails	Response 3-9			11-Sep
3-39	Bikes only trails	Response 3-9			11-Sep
3-40	Bikes only trails, more bike access, more narrow and single track trails	Response 3-9	Tanner	Wendt	11-Sep
3-41	More single track bike only trails	Response 3-9			22-Sep
3-42	More single track trails dedicated to mountain bikes	Response 3-9			29-Sep
3-43	More bike specific trails and multi-use trails	Response 3-9			3-Oct
3-44	Support providing more dedicated multi use narrow trails specifically including mt bikers	Response 3-9	Michael	Fernandez-Melone	6-Sep
3-45	XC and DH races on local trails would be a good source of revenue for the parks and fun for athletes and spectators	Noted	Matt	Mahoney	19-Sep
3-46	Competitive mt. bike events	Noted			3-Oct
3-47	Trails must be managed for safety. Very close to being run down by speeding cyclists many times, afraid to take my toddler on the trails	Noted	Julie	Hernandez	19-Sep

Chapter 3 Related Comments: Access, Interpretation, Recreation and Trails

No.	Comment	Response/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
3-48	Volunteer organizations in Santa Barbara have spots at trailheads to attach bells to bikes. The bells reduce the likelihood of collision	Noted	Matt	Mahoney	19-Sep
3-49	Improve awareness of all trail users to stay to the right, more signage.	Noted	BTCEB		22-Sep
3-50	Need trails that are safe to walk without speeding bicycles	Noted			19-Sep
3-51	Safety concerns with bikes not slowing down as they approach and pass hikers	Noted			22-Sep
3-52	Encourage use of one earbud only on trails. (to hear bikes that sound bells, etc.)	Noted			29-Sep
3-53	Fix the renegade bike trails at Pleasanton Ridge and Del Valle. Get bikes off narrow trails (French)	Noted	Bob	Cooper	3-Oct
3-54	Manage conflict between aggressive bikers and large number of hikers better. Restrict bikers on more popular trails that hikers use.	Noted	Suresh	Gadad	3-Oct
3-55	Do not open additional trails to mt. bikers, safety concerns	Noted			3-Oct
3-56	Bikes need to be restricted to trails where there is sufficient room to pass safely	Noted	Park User		22-Sep
3-57	As an ecologist my comments are that mt biker/bikers inflict intensive and widespread environmental damage on each and every landscape they invade, and systematically create an ever growing intensity of social and regulatory conflicts, starting when they attempt to invade formerly peaceful landscapes and far more seriously, once they are present. Two articles on the subject are with his letter.	Response 3-9	Brian	Horejski	31-Oct
3-58	Do not permit bikes on any public land and park trails. If you are unable to to this, confine them to roads or a specific area. Two articles on the subject are with his letter.	Response 3-9	Brian	Horejski	31-Oct
3-59	Acknowledge mountain biking as a growing community that shares in "trails for all"	Response 3-9			11-Sep
3-60	Modernize the Master Plan to all for true shared trails	Response 3-9	Michael	Mejia	11-Sep
3-61	More bike trails	Response 3-9	Sandy	Flores	11-Sep
3-62	More bike trails	Response 3-9	Joseph	Lyons	11-Sep
3-63	More bike trails	Response 3-9	Leslie	Floren	11-Sep
3-64	More bike trails	Response 3-9			11-Sep
3-65	More bike trails	Response 3-9			11-Sep
3-66	More bike trails, less equestrian trails	Response 3-9	Sandy	Flores	11-Sep
3-67	More multi-use trails and allow them on single track trails	Response 3-9	Terri	Jones	11-Sep
3-68	More multi-use, narrow trails in Redwood Park	Response 3-9	Christian	Brown	11-Sep
3-69	Need more mountain bike trails	Response 3-9	Jeff	Maddos	19-Sep
3-70	More biking	Response 3-9	Ryan	Taylor	19-Sep
3-71	More mt. bike trails	Response 3-9	Ryan	Taylor	19-Sep
3-72	More Mountain Bike trails	Response 3-9			19-Sep
3-73	More mt bike trails	Response 3-9	Tanner	Wendt	9-Oct
3-74	More trails for mt bikers, more variety, narrow trail access	Response 3-9			9-Oct
3-75	More access on existing and planned trails, including narrow trails.	Response 3-9	Rye	Gongora	11-Sep
3-76	More access on existing trails and more development of more trails between park parcels	Response 3-9	Steve	Smith	11-Sep
3-77	More access for bikers or bike specific trails	Response 3-9			3-Oct
3-78	Access should be as broad as it is to equestrians. More narrow trail access	Response 3-9	Shane	Bartling	11-Sep
3-79	Full access to bikes on, and increasing the number of, all narrow and multi-user trails in the District	Response 3-9		Bicycle Trails Council	11-Sep
3-80	Access to more narrow, multi use trails	Response 3-9			19-Sep
3-81	More single track mountain bike trails	Response 3-9			29-Sep
3-82	Access to single trak/narrow trails	Response 3-9	Joe	Floren	11-Sep
3-83	Construct more narrow trails	Response 3-9	Mike	Udkow	11-Sep
3-84	More access to narrow trails especially in Tilden	Response 3-9	Cheya	Samuelson	11-Sep
3-85	More narrow trails	Response 3-9			11-Sep
3-86	More narrow bike trails and bike specific trails with birms, jumps, technical	Response 3-9	Tanner	Wendt	11-Sep
3-87	More narrow bike trails	Response 3-9	Cheyla	Samuelson	11-Sep
3-88	More narrow bike trails for bikes only	Response 3-9	Victoria	Ortega	11-Sep
3-89	I support single track bike access	Response 3-9	Shane	Bartling	11-Sep
3-90	Single Track access	Response 3-9	Kyle	Winward	11-Sep
3-91	Single track trails for bikes	Response 3-9	Jason	Pappas	19-Sep
3-92	Happy the plan recognizes growing mt. bike need for narrow trails. Kids need to learn to ride on narrow trails to prepare for their races.	Response 3-9	Jeff	Maddox	19-Sep
3-93	More single track bike trails	Response 3-9	Doug	Kennedy	19-Sep
3-94	Dedicated single track bike trails, it's happening elsewhere	Response 3-9			19-Sep
3-95	Support access for mountain bikes on narrow trails	Response 3-9	John	Dube	3-Oct
3-96	Open narrow trails to bikes	Response 3-9	Jeff	Rebes	3-Oct

Chapter 3 Related Comments: Access, Interpretation, Recreation and Trails

No.	Comment	Response/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
3-97	No bikes on single track trails for safety reasons	Response 3-9			3-Oct
3-98	Narrow trails for Mt. bikers to reduce conflict between users	Response 3-9			3-Oct
3-99	More narrow trails for mt. bikes	Response 3-9			3-Oct
3-100	We want more dedicated multi use trails "narrow guage" for mountain bikers	Response 3-9			3-Oct
3-101	Likes bike trail access (single track) continue and add more	Response 3-9			3-Oct
3-102	Fire roads too rutted for safe mt biking, need narrow trails	Response 3-9			9-Oct
3-103	Mt. bikers should have access to existing narrow trails other than waiting for new construction	Response 3-9			9-Oct
3-104	More technical single tracked trails for bikes	Response 3-9			9-Oct
3-105	Create partnerships w/bike clubs and groups to assist w/single track trail maintenance	Response 3-9			9-Oct
3-106	Add more single track trails for bikes for safety (rutted fire trails are not safe)	Response 3-9			9-Oct
3-107	Mass single track	Response 3-9	Peter	Russell	9-Oct
3-108	Dedicated single track trail for mt bikes, no dogs	Response 3-9	Jill	Ludwig	9-Oct
3-109	Support the goals to provide more narrow trail experience for bikers.	Response 3-9	Michael	Fernandez-Melone	6-Sep
3-110	Thrilled to see District is open to providing additional dedicated and shared use narrow trails for bakers and hikers	Response 3-9	Xing	Li	9-Oct
3-111	In Switzerland all trails are open to mt. bikes including the most narrow ones, it does not pose any problems at all (he's a professor of physics at UC Berkeley)	Response 3-9	Uros	Seljak	10-Sep
3-112	Remove bicycle restricting from trails and Ordinance 38	Response 3-9	Dan	Levy	19-Sep
3-113	Ordinance 38 needs to be revised to eliminate prohibiting bikes on narrow trails	Response 3-9		Bicycle Trails Council	11-Sep
3-114	Ordinance 38 needs to evolve along with the demographics to eliminate the rule prohibiting bikes on narrow trails as soon as the M.P. is adopted.	Response 3-9	Greg	Bardino	3-Oct
3-115	Ordinance 38 needs to reflect new policy regarding mt. bikes on narrow trails	Response 3-9			3-Oct
3-116	Revise Ordinance 38 to accommodate cyclists	Response 3-9			3-Oct
3-117	Ordinance 38 is in conflict re bikes with M.P. policy language encouraging bikes on narrow trails	Response 3-9			3-Oct
3-118	Revise Ordinance 38 to allow bikes on single track trails	Response 3-9			9-Oct
3-119	Need to revise Ordinance 38 to eliminate the rule prohibiting bikes on narrow trails	Response 3-9	Michael	Fernandez-Melone	6-Sep
3-120	Modify Ordinance 38 to allow bikes on narrow trails	Response 3-9	Greg	Haet	12-Oct
3-121	Current language does not work in favor of bikers, need to change it so it no longer excludes bikes from narrow trails	Response 3-9	Xing	Li	9-Oct
3-122	Needs to be changed to eliminate rule prohibiting bikes on narrow trails	Response 3-9	William	Martin	10-Sep
3-123	Needs to be changed to eliminate rule prohibiting bikes on narrow trails	Response 3-9	Tom	Scarvie	7-Sep
3-124	Engage youth in parks through mt. biking and provide more trail access.	Response 3-9			11-Sep
3-125	Have safe trail circuits for youth	Response 3-9			11-Sep
3-126	Include local youth bike teams in design/building/maintenance of new multiuse and bike trails	Response 3-9	Leslie	Floren	11-Sep
3-127	People tell our high school bike team to get out of the way. We would like to be able to ride without being interrupted	Response 3-9	Victoria	Ortega	11-Sep
3-128	East Bay is world famous as unfriendly/Anti-mountain bike. Please help us change that	Response 3-9	Joe	Floren	11-Sep
3-129	Would like to encourage more balanced spending on bike access	Response 3-9			9-Oct
3-130	Some loop trails would be better if bikes only went one way.	Response 3-9	Jack	Bawers	11-Sep
3-131	Support bike trail use	Response 3-9	Jesse	Markman	11-Sep
3-132	Add more bike specific trails, increase access to single track, promote competitive events in the parks.	Response 3-9	Juan	Catano	3-Oct
3-133	More mt bike community partnerships in Livermore Area	Response 3-9			3-Oct
3-134	More connections between mt bike trails	Response 3-9			9-Oct
3-135	Mt. bikers and kids should be involved in trail maintenance	Response 3-9			9-Oct
3-136	Mt. bikers are aware of safety issues and trail ettiquette	Response 3-9			9-Oct
3-137	Hikers for mt. bikers	Response 3-9			9-Oct
3-138	Mt bike community of of users to provide input to Board and for other users as well	Response 3-9			9-Oct
3-139	Should be kept out of natural areas	Response 3-9			9-Oct
3-140	Improve mt bike trails and interconnectivity between parks and access to more narrow trails	Response 3-9			9-Oct
3-141	Promote trails for bikes to cyclists can get off streets	Response 3-9			9-Oct
3-142	Mt. bike trails	Response 3-9	Jeff	Cherniss	9-Oct
3-143	Mt bike trails	Response 3-9	Chris	Kirkle	9-Oct
3-144	Consider downhill only mountain bike trail for experienced users	Response 3-9	William	Martin	10-Sep
3-145	No bikes on dirt trails	Response 3-9	Harvey	Kletz	28-Oct
3-146	Improve boat launch access, provide carts for kayaks	Noted	Regional Parks	Association	22-Sep

Chapter 3 Related Comments: Access, Interpretation, Recreation and Trails

No.	Comment	Response/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
3-147	Fill out (establish) more back country camping in NW sector	Noted			9-Oct
3-148	Support camping	Noted	Sylvia	Finger	11-Sep
3-149	Page 51. This section could state the intent to provide camping facilities at intervals along the Bay Area Ridge Trail.	Noted	PAC		
3-150	607 Signatures from people asking to not allow mountain biking in natural areas behind the campus because of erosion, ruts, kills small animals and plants, drives wildlife away, so steep they are dangerous, they have taken over the trails, create illegal trails, etc.	Response 3-9	Mike	Vandeman	18-Oct
3-151	You don't have have any disc golf courses, Pt Pinole park has areas of unutilized space that could accommodate one or more courses	Noted	Glenn	Murray	1-Oct
3-152	Need a list of available ADA parks and places???	Response 3-15	Advocate for PWDs	Frail & Elderly	19-Sep
3-153	She's happy the District is accommodating those with disabilities and fostering youth	Noted	Nancy	Delaney	11-Sep
3-154	Establish web trails for people with accessibility needs (looks like a circle with a spider web in the middle of it)	Response 3-15			9-Oct
3-155	Need more trails with dog regulations has been bitten twice in the last year	Response 3-12	Judy	Thomas	11-Sep
3-156	Increased education to explain off-leash dog policies on multi-use trails	Response 3-12			11-Sep
3-157	Keep existing off leash dog regulations. Don't mix off leash with the general public.	Response 3-12			11-Sep
3-158	There's a need for better understanding of "ethic" for dog walkers to avoid conflict	Response 3-12			11-Sep
3-159	Someday every dog in parks will be electronically registered and hikers will have a receiver to cite the dog	Response 3-12	Jack	Bawers	11-Sep
3-160	Safety concerns with dogs off leash and dogs approaching.	Response 3-12			22-Sep
3-161	Problem w/dogs off leash. Conflict w/children, walkers, hikers. Distance on how far pets can be from owner not clear in the park rules	Response 3-12			29-Sep
3-162	Safety in parks because of dogs off leash and the wild animals	Response 3-12			29-Sep
3-163	Need education program for dog owners on managing dogs in park. Upon entry to park rules should be given to people with dogs	Response 3-12			29-Sep
3-164	Dogs should yield to all other trail users.	Response 3-12			29-Sep
3-165	Need more rules to manage dogs and prevent arguments	Response 3-12			29-Sep
3-166	Establish obedience standards for dogs on trails, example by your side when approaching others	Response 3-12			9-Oct
3-167	More dog access	Response 3-12	Karin	MacDonald	11-Sep
3-168	More trails available to people with dogs	Response 3-12	Andrew	Sigal	11-Sep
3-169	Add trails for people with dogs	Response 3-12			11-Sep
3-170	New trails for dog walkers.	Response 3-12	Robin	Goodfellow	11-Sep
3-171	Preserve and expand off leash areas for dogs	Response 3-12			11-Sep
3-172	Don't inhibit off leash hiking with dogs.	Response 3-12	Susan	Wilson	11-Sep
3-173	Continue to have an abundance of trails for off leash dogs	Response 3-12	Glenn		11-Sep
3-174	Continue to offer off-leash dog areas for recreation	Response 3-12			11-Sep
3-175	Don't cut back on off leash trails	Response 3-12	Leah	Itelson	11-Sep
3-176	Extremely important to have off leash trails.	Response 3-12		PIDO	11-Sep
3-177	Keep areas open to off-leash to avoid compressing them into small areas	Response 3-12			11-Sep
3-178	Keep off leash areas	Response 3-12	Karen	Baskin	11-Sep
3-179	Maintain off-leash dog activities/opportunities	Response 3-12			11-Sep
3-180	Support off leash trails, dog owners should have greater voice in policy than equestrians.	Response 3-12	Judith	Maguire	11-Sep
3-181	Off leash dog walking should be covered in the type of use for trails.	Response 3-12	Beatriz	Quezada	11-Sep
3-182	Off Leash - all over	Response 3-12	Bob & Gabi	Wills	11-Sep
3-183	More trails for off leash	Response 3-12			11-Sep
3-184	Continue to have an abundance of off leash trails to walk dogs	Response 3-12	Glenn	Millstone	19-Sep
3-185	Continue to have abundance of off leash trails. It meets the needs of a growing population.	Response 3-12	Glenn	Millstone	19-Sep
3-186	Continue and Expand	Response 3-12			19-Sep
3-187	Continue to have abundance off off leash trails, it contributes to happy and healthy dogs, people and community	Response 3-12			19-Sep
3-188	More separate off leash dog opportunities	Response 3-12			19-Sep
3-189	Develop and maintain off leash trails	Response 3-12			19-Sep
3-190	Mitigate dog conflict by opening more space for off leash use rather than contracting it	Response 3-12			19-Sep
3-191	One section of beach on island of Alameda for off leash	Response 3-12	Lisa	Brown	29-Sep
3-192	All dogs off leash at MLK to control rodent population	Response 3-12	Lisa	Brown	29-Sep
3-193	Concerned dog will be excluded from trails along with off leash trails. Need space to run off leash	Response 3-12	SLDTC		29-Sep
3-194	Support off leash	Response 3-12			29-Sep
3-195	Keep off leash and add more off leash	Response 3-12			29-Sep
3-196	Allow dogs off leash on at least one beach in Alameda	Response 3-12			29-Sep
3-197	Allow sections of MLK shoreline for off leash	Response 3-12			29-Sep

Chapter 3 Related Comments: Access, Interpretation, Recreation and Trails

No.	Comment	Response/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
3-198	Appreciate the off leash areas. Hopefully, cattle grazing is closely regulated and monitored	Response 3-12	Diane	Dickey	9-Oct
3-199	More off leash areas	Response 3-12			9-Oct
3-200	Keep rules allowing dogs off leash	Response 3-12			9-Oct
3-201	Current leash free areas remain off leash	Response 3-12			9-Oct
3-202	More leash free areas	Response 3-12			9-Oct
3-203	Preserve off leash dog access throughout the District to promote healthy exercise	Response 3-12			9-Oct
3-204	Expand off leash areas	Response 3-12			9-Oct
3-205	Off leash rocks	Response 3-12	Beth	Davis	9-Oct
3-206	Keep off leash dog access in the parks	Response 3-12	Marla	Miyashiro	9-Oct
3-207	Continue to allow dogs off leash	Response 3-12	Barbara	Berry	9-Oct
3-208	The MP is silent about off leash dogs on trails	Noted	Ellen	Liebman	11-Oct
3-209	Should be on leash in areas with native habitat and natural resources	Noted	Al	Minard	11-Sep
3-210	On leash on single track trails like Redwood	Noted			11-Sep
3-211	Dogs on leash where lots of people visit = Mission Peak, etc.	Noted			29-Sep
3-212	Dog owners should be changed to people with dogs	Response 3-10			11-Sep
3-213	Persons with dogs should be identified as a separate set of trail users	Response 3-10			11-Sep
3-214	Replace dog owners with people with dogs	Response 3-10			19-Sep
3-215	Verbage is misleading, dog owners should be people with dogs	Response 3-10	SLDTC		29-Sep
3-216	People with dogs, not dog owners	Response 3-10			29-Sep
3-217	Problematic, jump on people, owners don't clean up after them. Need a poly to consider the feces affects on creeks	Noted	Julie	Bongers	11-Sep
3-218	Use Coastal Cleanup event/volunteer process for cleanup of dog waste. Improve signage and enforcement.	Noted			29-Sep
3-219	If plastic bags are banned, lots of people won't have free bags for picking up dog poop, there will be more of it on the Iron Horse Trail	Noted	Joe	Hearst	3-Oct
3-220	Enforce dog poop bag pickup	Noted			9-Oct
3-221	Open more trails to certified dog walkers	Noted			11-Sep
3-222	South Park Drive should be open to professional dog walkers	Noted			11-Sep
3-223	More off leash trails for professional dog walkers	Noted	Judith	Maguire	11-Sep
3-224	Expand access to hiking trails for dogs, including commercial permit holders	Noted			19-Sep
3-225	Open Miller Knox to commercial dog walkers	Noted			19-Sep
3-226	Open S. Park Dr. winter weekdays to commercial dog walkers 10:00-4:00	Noted			19-Sep
3-227	Open seaview steam trains??? To commercial dog walkers	Noted			19-Sep
3-228	Commerical dog walkers serve an aging and disabled population that needs services	Noted			19-Sep
3-229	Increase fee for commercial dog walkers and eliminate supplemental permits	Noted			19-Sep
3-230	Have serious concerns about access to professionals. Limits and restrictions will hamper or destroy hardworking professional courteous businesses.	Noted	Todd	Perlman	9-Oct
3-231	If trail is removed from professional dog walker list, another will be added	Noted			9-Oct
3-232	Professionals should be allowed to walk dogs in Tilden and Miller-Knox	Noted	Beverly	Lane	9-Oct
3-233	concerned about ongoing practice of restricting dogs on popular trails while never opening up new trails to this user group	Response 3-12	Barnsdale	& Yoshikawa, et al	9-Oct
3-234	Continue to remain open and available to dog owners and dog walkers	Response 3-12			11-Sep
3-235	Day and time restrictions on some multi-use and single trails may provide more accessibility	Response 3-12	Pat	Sievers	11-Sep
3-236	Do not restrict trails to them	Response 3-12	Bruce	Joffee	11-Sep
3-237	Dog owners should have more weight than equestrians because more dog owner tax payers	Response 3-12			11-Sep
3-238	Don't have a dog, don't want a dog, can't stand being surrounded with dogs. Esp. pitbulls	Response 3-12	Elisabeth	Heidorn	11-Sep
3-239	Don't think persons with dogs should be identified as a separate set of trail users	Response 3-12			11-Sep
3-240	Revenue generation by setting up only system for owners and walkers to register their dogs for nominal voluntary fee	Response 3-12			11-Sep
3-241	Thank you for giving us so many options for dogs	Response 3-12		PIDO	11-Sep
3-242	Speaking out for the pups	Response 3-12	Joanne	Chen	11-Sep
3-243	Speaking on behalf of the dogs	Response 3-12	Beatriz	Quezada	11-Sep
3-244	Trails should be inclusive of all, including anyone with dogs	Response 3-12	Jill	Rian	11-Sep
3-245	Keep trails open and available	Response 3-12	Jeanette	Bachman	11-Sep
3-246	Good job	Response 3-12	William	Carman	11-Sep
3-247	Encourage more persons with dogs to use trails	Response 3-12			11-Sep
3-248	Contributes to healthy and happy dogs and people	Response 3-12			19-Sep

Chapter 3 Related Comments: Access, Interpretation, Recreation and Trails

No.	Comment	Response/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
3-249	Trails for dogs and horses should be separated 40% households own dogs, 1.8% own horses	Response 3-12			19-Sep
3-250	What is the policy that prohibits dogs in certain areas such as Round Valley	Response 3-12			22-Sep
3-251	Have informational panels stating the dog policy at sites where they are not allowed	Response 3-12			22-Sep
3-252	No verbage to protect areas for dogs to exercise off lead. 40% of tax payers are dog owners.	Response 3-12	SLDTC		29-Sep
3-253	Concerned about what I see as decreasing access for dogs on EBRPD trails and open spaces specifically the proposed change to Albany Beach to a leash only or no dog allowed status. I see nothing in the MP that addresses the needs of our four pawed friends	Response 3-11 and 3-12	Tom	Squire	9-Oct
3-254	Give voice to senior citizen groups who are dog owners using the trails	Response 3-11 and 3-12			9-Oct
3-255	Wants to see more 4 footed friends (dogs) Concerned about Albany Beach	Response 3-12			9-Oct
3-256	Keep trails open to dogs	Response 3-12			9-Oct
3-257	Should be kept out of natural areas	Response 3-12			9-Oct
3-258	South Park for all dogs	Response 3-12	Judith	Maguire	9-Oct
3-259	Dogs trails	Response 3-12	Jeff	Cherniss	9-Oct
3-260	Dog park rules and off leash access	Response 3-12	Suzanne	Gilmore	9-Oct
3-261	Dog parks please	Response 3-12	Carole	Ekker	9-Oct
3-262	Would like to work with District on a comprehensive plan for our user group	Response 3-12	Barnsdale	& Yoshikawa, et al	9-Oct
3-263	Please provide the support for your assertion that "Dog owners are a minority" in your webpage under activities/dogs/faq	Noted	Christina	Molteni	14-Oct
3-264	Problems would disappear if their rule exists "Owners must have their dogs at their side under control (voice or leash) when approaching others on the trail"	Noted	Ellen	Liebman	11-Oct
3-265	EBMUD lands should be managed by EBMUD. Permitting process should be maintained	Noted			3-Oct
3-266	EBRPD should manage EBMUD trails to improve access and eliminate permitting requirement. Open more trails on EBMUD lands	Noted			3-Oct
3-267	Support environmental education in K-12 and college	Noted	Pelagio	Borrega	22-Sep
3-268	Support increased emphasis on environmental education combined with recreation	Noted			19-Sep
3-269	Tesla is an important native habitat and wildland, should be an education center for K-12 and university level research	Noted			22-Sep
3-270	Environmental education should include cultural (Native American) education. Importance of Brushy Peak and Tesla Pass	Noted			22-Sep
3-271	Explore using historical interpretive, costumed docents (college/actors)	Noted			22-Sep
3-272	An application for mobile devises with ability to view and download park maps, buy fishing permits, prepay for parking, or make reservations would be helpful	Noted	Ben	Nomura-Weingrow	24-Sep
3-273	With increased population, horse owners have become limited in riding options, please retain the safety of single tracs for equestrians	Response 3-14	San Ramon	Valley Horse	19-Sep
3-274	Horses + bike = injury	Response 3-14	Deborah	Johnston	3-Oct
3-275	Single track trails shared by horses and bikes are dangerous for both. Bikers do not control their speed, I've almost been hit or run-off the trail many times	Response 3-14	Deborah	Johnston	3-Oct
3-276	Horsemen's Assoc. concerned about safety with bicyclists. Money raised for multi-use trail concerned about safety w/other users. Speed, no motorized	Response 3-14			9-Oct
3-277	Require permit for equestrians for incident tracking purposes	Noted			9-Oct
3-278	Horses on single track	Noted	Victor	Deguin	3-Oct
3-279	Address/collect horse poop	Noted			19-Sep
3-280	Owners should be required to pick up after their horse	Noted			19-Sep
3-281	Owners should have to clean up after their horses	Noted			19-Sep
3-282	Is unsightly and not "natural" often treated with oral medications resulting in chemicals in feces. Should be required to use a feces collection under its tail.	Noted	Amy	Arcus	17-Oct
3-283	Separate horse/hiker trails between Skyline Ranch and Piedmont Stables/McDonald Trail	Response 3-14	Amelia	Marshall	11-Sep
3-284	Separate horse/hiker trails	Response 3-14	Amelia	Marshall	11-Sep
3-285	More bikers than equestrians so more trails should be open to bikes	Noted	Sandy	Flores	11-Sep
3-286	Don't allow horse trails to take over	Response 3-14	Jason	Simonds	19-Sep
3-287	Don't expand horse trails	Response 3-14	Jessica	Simonds	19-Sep
3-288	Preserve the safety of single track trails for equestrians	Response 3-14			19-Sep
3-289	All equestrians should have permits to use trails	Noted			19-Sep
3-290	More inclusion for ADA accessible equestrian uses, driving horses	Response 3-15			19-Sep
3-291	Horse/pony carts should be allowed on trails because of aging equestrians and handicapped community	Response 3-15	East County	Horsemens Assoc	19-Sep
3-292	Add staging areas for equestrian: truck & trailer and horses (Lake Chabot for example)	Noted			29-Sep
3-293	Horses have as much impact as OHV	Noted			29-Sep

Chapter 3 Related Comments: Access, Interpretation, Recreation and Trails

No.	Comment	Response/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
3-294	Equestrian use provides a way form women over 50 to use the parks	Noted			9-Oct
3-295	Equestrian riders have had access to trails that other tax payers have not had access to. Bikes re much more common in the parks than horses. Unfair to provide narrow trails for equestrians and not bikers. EBRPD signs show that the horse has the right of way, this is unfair and unjustified.	Noted	Amy	Arcus	17-Oct
3-296	Continue the District's interpretive role at various parks	Noted			29-Sep
3-297	Need more interpretive signs	Noted			29-Sep
3-298	Policy should include disabled as trail users	Response 3-15			29-Sep
3-299	Keep extensive hourseback riding access as part of M.P., Safety concerns with bikes/horses on single tracs	Noted	Jane	Hart	19-Sep
3-300	Add to M.P. "It is the District's policy that dogs can be off-leash unless otherwise noted in Ordinance 38"	Noted			11-Sep
3-301	Policy should include dogs at trail users	Noted			29-Sep
3-302	Likes "human powered" users policy	Noted			19-Sep
3-303	Trails for all policy should be expanded to specify that OHV use is not allowed due to the destructive nature.	Noted			22-Sep
3-304	Do not lose sight of lower income constituents in "changing demographics" not all are high-tech and high-income	Noted			22-Sep
3-305	Add language to MP indicating a goal to provide more narrow-trail experiences for mountain bikers on existing trails as well as new ones.	Noted	William	Martin	10-Sep
3-306	Add language t MP that lays out a goal to provide more narrow trail experiences for mt. bikers on existing and new trails	Noted	Tom	Scarvie	7-Sep
3-307	Request adding language indicating a goal to provide more equivalent, narro trail experiences for mt. bikers on existing and new trails	Noted	Weston	Settlemier	19-Sep
3-308	page 48 paved multi-use trails, define "green transportation"	Noted			22-Sep
3-309	MP should state use of parks is for non-motorized except to accommodate disabled needs	Noted			3-Oct
3-310	I support the new Master Plan and advocate preservation of natural areas that prohibit use of OHV.	Noted	Kathleen	Costa	22-Sep
3-311	Support MP especially in relation to preservation of natural areas prohibiting OHV	Noted	Steve	Pautell	
3-312	Model airplanes	Noted	Mike	Woodring	19-Sep
3-313	Continue no motorized vehicles policy	Response 3-7	Janis	Kate	29-Sep
3-314	Continue no motorized vehicles on trails policy	Response 3-7			29-Sep
3-315	Please continue policy on no motorized vehicles on trails	Response 3-7			29-Sep
3-316	No motorized vehicles on trails	Response 3-7			29-Sep
3-317	Continue no motorized vehicles policy	Response 3-7			29-Sep
3-318	Trails for all should not include motor vehicles	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-319	Promote fitness through motorized vehicles	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-320	Motorized vehicles are motivational for children. Sees more kids on motorbikes than hiking	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-321	Keep parks from use of motorized vehicles, even separate areas, the noise will travel.	Response 3-7	Edwin	Osada	3-Oct
3-322	Add OHV use for Alameda County in the Master Plan	Response 3-7			11-Sep
3-323	Not mentioned in trails for all	Response 3-7			11-Sep
3-324	Should be included in trails for all	Response 3-7			11-Sep
3-325	Trails for all includes OHV community	Response 3-7			11-Sep
3-326	Consider OHV in Master Plans	Response 3-7			19-Sep
3-327	Consider OHV in Master Plan	Response 3-7			19-Sep
3-328	Consider OHV use in Master Plan, remove Tesla from M.P.	Response 3-7			19-Sep
3-329	Amend the Master Plan map to reflect current and future needs for OHV recreation on District land	Response 3-7		Blue Ribbon Coalition	
3-330	Conduct new survey that includes OHV recreation as an approved or authorized activity on District lands	Response 3-7		Blue Ribbon Coalition	
3-331	Cease and desist current efforts to influence OHV recreation on Telsa property	Response 3-7		Blue Ribbon Coalition	
3-332	Remove from the Master Plan Map	Response 3-7		Blue Ribbon Coalition	
3-333	Withdraw the July 11, 2012 comment letter to Carnegie SVRA advocating non-motorized use on Tesla property	Response 3-7		Blue Ribbon Coalition	
3-334	Exclude OHV use on trails	Response 3-7	Celeste	Garamendi	11-Sep
3-335	Keep trails for low impact use i.e. not OHV, keep Tesla in the M.P.	Response 3-7			11-Sep
3-336	Master Plan Policy - Clarify in policy that OHV is not included on the trails	Response 3-7			11-Sep
3-337	No OHV users, too loud and disruptive	Response 3-7		Piedmont Stables	11-Sep
3-338	Park is a place of peace for all users. Off road vehicles would change the environment	Response 3-7			11-Sep
3-339	Should not include OHV in trails for all	Response 3-7			11-Sep
3-340	Trails for all is too broad and should not include OHV users.	Response 3-7			11-Sep
3-341	Keep our parks green	Response 3-7	Judi	Marin	11-Sep
3-342	Trails for all should not include OHV	Response 3-7			11-Sep
3-343	Dangerous to share space with OHV users in any park	Response 3-7	Jane	Hart	19-Sep

Chapter 3 Related Comments: Access, Interpretation, Recreation and Trails

No.	Comment	Response/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
3-344	Please don't plan, introduce or include any OHV usage on public land in Alameda Co.	Response 3-7	Irene	Jones	20-Sep
3-345	The comments that Tesla is need because Carnegie has been so damaged is the best argument against OHV use in EBRPD lands	Response 3-7	Celeste	Garamendi	19-Sep
3-346	Trails not for OHV, no OHV	Response 3-7			19-Sep
3-347	Keep OHV out of parks	Response 3-7			22-Sep
3-348	OHV incompatible with natural resources	Response 3-7			29-Sep
3-349	Both trails only and free ride types of OHV uses are destructive (Carnegie)	Response 3-7			29-Sep
3-350	Support existing policy for no OHV use, too destructive and incompatible with low impact trail use	Response 3-7			29-Sep
3-351	Environ. Prot. And preservatin should be top priority for EBRPD, motor vehicles is not consistent with that priority.	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-352	No OHV in the parks	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-353	State Parks survey on park activities showed OHV is not in the top 15, so spend money on preserving low impact open space.	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-354	No OHV in the parks	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-355	Stay with the Mission Statement. Do not deviate by letting OHV users in EBRPD. Keep Tesla in M.P.	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-356	Concerns over safety from OHV use. Would crowd others out and create inclusivity at the expense of others.	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-357	No OHV in the parks	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-358	No OHV in any park, ever	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-359	No OHV in parks due to high cost of restoratin and loss of esthetic and biological values	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-360	Concerned that EBRPD does not provide OHV recreation	Response 3-7	Ken	Clarke	11-Sep
3-361	Currently no trails available to OHV	Response 3-7			11-Sep
3-362	EBRPD has zero land for OHV	Response 3-7	Mark	Fagerroos	11-Sep
3-363	Very popular form of recreation yet District has zero OHV parks.	Response 3-7			11-Sep
3-364	110,000 acres, zero for OHVs	Response 3-7			19-Sep
3-365	There are zero OHV opportunities on EBRPD land	Response 3-7			22-Sep
3-366	2011 DMV stat over 28,000 registered OHVs in CC and Alameda Co. Note 1 acre of EBRPD property available for OHV	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-367	There is no land for OHV use in District. It's a use that is needed. Taxed without representation	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-368	EBRPD does not have one square inch for OHV use/available land (3 people)	Response 3-7			9-Oct
3-369	EBRPD has zero trails for OHV	Response 3-7	Sherry	Stortroen	29-Oct
3-370	At 56, has seen the OHV land available dwindle to nothing in the largest park district in the nation	Response 3-7			9-Oct
3-371	26 years ago you took away riding area on Redwood Rd. and promised to find another place, still waiting 26 years later	Response 3-7	Chuck	Oliver	11-Sep
3-372	A source of revenue if you open an OHV park such as Santa Clara Co. Metcalf OHV park.	Response 3-7			11-Sep
3-373	Excluding OHV does not allow equal opporutuity for all park users	Response 3-7			11-Sep
3-374	If allow OHV, require them to be electric and not decrease air quality	Response 3-7	Julie	Bongers	11-Sep
3-375	Increase OHV access	Response 3-7	Kevin	Puent	11-Sep
3-376	Keep OHV parks open, need more OHV parks	Response 3-7	Curtis	Nagengast	11-Sep
3-377	Leave Carnegie for OHV access	Response 3-7	Lori	Lewis	11-Sep
3-378	More OHV access closer to home	Response 3-7	Wandering	Wheeler	11-Sep
3-379	Need more	Response 3-7	Kevin	Moore	11-Sep
3-380	Need OHV park for all ages	Response 3-7			11-Sep
3-381	Need some riding areas	Response 3-7	Jerry	Fouts	11-Sep
3-382	OHV users are trail users and EBRPD should support OHV recreation with more access	Response 3-7			11-Sep
3-383	Open an OHV facility	Response 3-7			11-Sep
3-384	Plan for OHV use and associated family camping	Response 3-7			11-Sep
3-385	There is a lack of OHV access	Response 3-7			11-Sep
3-386	OHV Trails	Response 3-7	Lori	Lewis	11-Sep
3-387	Trails for all should include OHV, 28,000 OHVs registerd in CCC and Alameda Co.	Response 3-7			11-Sep
3-388	Carnegie OHV Opportunities	Response 3-7	Jim	Lubin	11-Sep
3-389	More OHV Trails	Response 3-7	Arthur	Matlakiewicz	19-Sep
3-390	Quite taking our dirt bike trails	Response 3-7	Jason	Simonds	19-Sep
3-391	Use OHV money for OHV use	Response 3-7	Paul	Muller	19-Sep
3-392	Need OHV areas	Response 3-7	Ken	Clarke	19-Sep
3-393	Public lands should be open to all of the public including OHVs	Response 3-7	Geoffrey	Beasley	19-Sep
3-394	More OHV	Response 3-7	Ryan	Taylor	19-Sep
3-395	Need OHV recreation	Response 3-7	Don	Amador	19-Sep

Chapter 3 Related Comments: Access, Interpretation, Recreation and Trails

No.	Comment	Response/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
3-396	New OHV parks	Response 3-7	Diane	Malls	19-Sep
3-397	Please keep OHV recreation open for our families	Response 3-7	Charles	Dyer	19-Sep
3-398	Pleas keep OHV open for our families	Response 3-7	Craig	Guidinger	19-Sep
3-399	OHV	Response 3-7	Diana	Mead	19-Sep
3-400	Need OHV	Response 3-7	Dave	Duffin	19-Sep
3-401	More land	Response 3-7	Dean	Sweet	19-Sep
3-402	We need OHV space	Response 3-7	Ken	Clarke	22-Sep
3-403	O'Brian said "There is a park for every form of recreation" Offer OHV parks it's needed by thousands of East Bay citizens	Response 3-7	Patrick	Baird	19-Sep
3-404	Keep OHV riding areas open, expand Carnegie, take Carnegie off the Master Plan	Response 3-7	Marshall	Goodran	19-Sep
3-405	Open OHV land	Response 3-7	Ryan	Taylor	19-Sep
3-406	Open land to OHV use so kids have a place to ride motorcycles	Response 3-7	Craig	Guidinger	19-Sep
3-407	Expand OHV parks, don't close Carnegie	Response 3-7	Jason	Simonds	19-Sep
3-408	Don't close OHV parks, expand riding areas	Response 3-7	Jessica	Simonds	19-Sep
3-409	Closing money making parks like Carnegie doesn't make sense, also people will lose jobs.	Response 3-7	Brenden	Rasmussen	22-Sep
3-410	Share property with OHV people. Tilden was bought with OHV monies. OHV people volunteer a great deal of time to help our parks	Response 3-7	Diablo 4 Wheel		22-Sep
3-411	How does off road recreation fit in	Response 3-7			19-Sep
3-412	OHV is getting pushed out	Response 3-7			19-Sep
3-413	OHV volunteers	Response 3-7			19-Sep
3-414	Green sticker money - OHV to general fund instead of OHV	Response 3-7			19-Sep
3-415	Should consider OHV users as tax payers w/equal right to land use esp. when land belongs to OHV	Response 3-7			19-Sep
3-416	The District should consider OHV district wide as appropriate	Response 3-7			19-Sep
3-417	OHV community under-acknowledged and underserved	Response 3-7			19-Sep
3-418	Fastest growing, largest form of outdoor recreation. Carnegie and Tesla paid for with OHV funds	Response 3-7			19-Sep
3-419	District should provide OHV opportunities	Response 3-7			19-Sep
3-420	Stay out of Carnegie	Response 3-7			19-Sep
3-421	Keep OHV away from populated areas. Give them room to exercise their sport at Tesla site. OHV should be more remote	Response 3-7			19-Sep
3-422	District should partner with OHV community and State Parks OHV Division	Response 3-7			19-Sep
3-423	Look for OHV compatible land to acquire	Response 3-7			19-Sep
3-424	Stop ignoring OHV community and reach out to it. Allow Tesla to open to relieve resource impacts on Carnegie	Response 3-7			19-Sep
3-425	Has educational and learning (mechanical) benefits consider OHV in M.P.	Response 3-7			19-Sep
3-426	Consider opening trails to OHV	Response 3-7			19-Sep
3-427	Don't change District policy on motorized uses. OHV use is most destructive use of public lands	Response 3-7			19-Sep
3-428	Do not promotoe non-OHV uses	Response 3-7			19-Sep
3-429	OHV not compatible with non-OHV. District should maintain focus on natural, historic and cultural resource preservation	Response 3-7			19-Sep
3-430	Fastest growing form of recreation	Response 3-7			19-Sep
3-431	More open trails for everyone, including OHV	Response 3-7			22-Sep
3-432	Support OHV	Response 3-7			22-Sep
3-433	Support OH only where the noise, dust, danger to others and trail destruction are not a factor	Response 3-7			22-Sep
3-434	Expand or open OHV opportunities in EBRPD	Response 3-7			22-Sep
3-435	Reduce carbon footprint by providing OHV opportunities closer to users	Response 3-7			22-Sep
3-436	Limit OHV on EBRPD lands. Don't belong in natural areas and prefer not be subject to noise pollution	Response 3-7			22-Sep
3-437	Consider providing more OHV opportunities	Response 3-7			22-Sep
3-438	EBRPD has over 100,00 acres of land and there are only 1,300 acres for OHV in Alameda and CC Counties	Response 3-7			22-Sep
3-439	Acknowledge OHV v olunteer work by allowing OHV land use	Response 3-7			22-Sep
3-440	Why doesn't EBRPD have any OHV properties or policies in the Master Plan	Response 3-7			22-Sep
3-441	What is EBRPD's policy on off highway vehicles?	Response 3-7			22-Sep
3-442	EBRPD needs to co-exist with OHV users	Response 3-7			22-Sep
3-443	More OHV opportunities in the District	Response 3-7			22-Sep
3-444	Partner w/State to expand Carnegie	Response 3-7			22-Sep
3-445	Fastest growing demographic of outdoor recreation. Need to replace Redwood Ranch OHV area perhaps at Coyote Hills by Dunbarton bridge.	Response 3-7			29-Sep
3-446	Concrened about loosing OHV lands to uses ther than off road motorcycle riding	Response 3-7	Bill	Cooley	29-Sep

Chapter 3 Related Comments: Access, Interpretation, Recreation and Trails

No.	Comment	Response/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
3-447	EBRPD should provide OHV oportunities	Response 3-7			29-Sep
3-448	More public lands for OHV use. Over Crowding of use areas can be more damaging, so redistribute use.	Response 3-7			29-Sep
3-449	Make room for OHV use in existing parks	Response 3-7			29-Sep
3-450	Motorized OHV trails	Response 3-7			29-Sep
3-451	Partner with OHV community to examine multi-use opportunities	Response 3-7			29-Sep
3-452	Add OHV use to existing parks	Response 3-7			29-Sep
3-453	Replace Redwood Ranch OHV area	Response 3-7			29-Sep
3-454	More OHV access	Response 3-7			29-Sep
3-455	Allow in existing parks	Response 3-7			29-Sep
3-456	More open land for OHV, ATV/motorcycle. Tesla for 4 wheel drive vehicles (4 x 4)	Response 3-7			29-Sep
3-457	Partner with OHV community to provide OHV recreation	Response 3-7			29-Sep
3-458	Make room for OHV use in existing parks	Response 3-7			29-Sep
3-459	Put a motocross track in the Lake Chabot park	Response 3-7	Allan	Burby	3-Oct
3-460	Please provide OHV Recreation	Response 3-7	Ken	Clarke	3-Oct
3-461	Expand Carnegie for OHV use	Response 3-7	Kip	Siegel	3-Oct
3-462	Expand Carnegie OHV park	Response 3-7	Ed	Heacox	3-Oct
3-463	OHV park please	Response 3-7	Arthur	Matlakiewicz	3-Oct
3-464	We love Carnegie SVRA. In this time of economic hardship, it is an affordable way to have fun with our kids and make family memories. Please give us the space we deserve	Response 3-7	Dave	Wright	3-Oct
3-465	Love hiking and mt. biking in EBRPD parks, there are not shortages of places to do this. However, only onel ocation left in East Bay to ride OHV and it has become crowded. Stop pursuing Tesla, do not take Carnegie away from OHV riders	Response 3-7	Jacquelyn	Etter	3-Oct
3-466	Need more Ohv trails and parks, currently very few can be easily accessed. There are way more oppotunities for another great park.	Response 3-7	Jackson	Winn	3-Oct
3-467	Promote greater access to park land specifically dirt motorcycles. Rules only prohibit motor vehicles in wilderness ares, hence allow off road vehicles.	Response 3-7	Doug	McEtchin	3-Oct
3-468	Keep your hands off Carnegie/OHV land. State is more than capable of managing any environmental concerns or historical preservation. Bought with OHV funds, should be used for OHV recreation.	Response 3-7	Bruce	Kelley	3-Oct
3-469	Explain Trails for All as far as I know there is only 1 Trails for all park and it is Carnegie. If you take a park purchased with OHV funds you better open up all other parks so they have Trails for all.	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-470	Keep your hands off Carnegie/Tesla. Open more OHV parks to accommodate the thousands of users. Trails for all means OHV too.	Response 3-7	Curtis		3-Oct
3-471	Work with State Parks to provide more OHV opportunities	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-472	Reaffirm commitment ot work with sister agencies, including State parks OHV Division	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-473	OHV are part of "all" where are all of our OHV parks?	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-474	OHV users were not surveyed as part of the Master Plan process.	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-475	Has EBRPD contacted OHMVR?	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-476	District needs to open an intensive OHV area like Club Moto, to replace Redwood Ranch that was closed. Club Moto has provided 100's of thousands of days of recreation with no negative environmental impacts.	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-477	Include OHV park like in County of Santa Clara	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-478	District should have more OHV trails	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-479	Would like to see land for OHV use	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-480	Would like EBRPD to include OHV use	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-481	Propmote use of parklands for OHV use	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-482	Include access for OHV	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-483	i.e. Metcalf OHV in Santa Clara	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-484	Acquire more property for OHV	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-485	Current OHV areas are overpopulated	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-486	Consider apportioning existing park lands for OHV use	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-487	All means all, OHV is part of all	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-488	Trails for all should include at least one OHV site	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-489	Is OHV included in the definition of "recreation"	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-490	Trails for all should include OHV	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-491	More attention to OHV facilities, few in the area	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-492	More representation for OHV users	Response 3-7			3-Oct

Chapter 3 Related Comments: Access, Interpretation, Recreation and Trails

No.	Comment	Response/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
3-493	As Ohv rider, I'm often impressed that wild animals do not seem disturbed by OHV in Carnegie	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-494	District should designate an open, motorized rec area for the community and families of OHV riders similar to Santa Clary County park. Has not motorized recreation in over 100,000 acres for other uses	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-495	No one else can share a trail with a motorcycle	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-496	One park dedicated to OHV	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-497	Use Renz property in Holister OHV park as a model	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-498	Share park system with more diverse clientele - OHV	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-499	How would EBRPD reach out to OHV groups?	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-500	Trails for all should include OHV in designated areas	Response 3-7			3-Oct
3-501	You closed Redwood and now I must drive 60 miles to go riding. Now you want to take away our closest riding area in San Joaquin Co. Your results not even close to the State's which found OHV in the top 7 in San Francisco and 3rd in the valley. You are all controlled by evil politically correct outsiders.	Response 3-7	Diane	Oliver	9-Oct
3-502	Use Carnegie as a laboratory to experiment with ways to restore damage done to land by OHV use. Make sure what happened to Carnegie does not happen again.	Response 3-7			9-Oct
3-503	OHV flash mobs are plugging up the MP meetings w/repetitious comments. If a subject has been mentioned once, don't accept it again	Response 3-7	Arthur	Hull	24-Sep
3-504	Include OHV enthusiasts in your outreach efforts. OHMVRD has an extensive mailing list of those individuals	Response 3-7	OHMVR Commission	Mr. Slavik	15-Oct
3-505	Revise Ordinance 38	Noted			9-Oct
3-506	Open parks at night	Noted			19-Sep
3-507	Open for night biking and hiking	Noted	Ryan	Taylor	19-Sep
3-508	Open new property for what it was intended for	Noted	Don	Chamblee	19-Sep
3-509	Later Hours, after dark	Noted			19-Sep
3-510	Better signage clarifying curfew times at Diablo Foothills	Noted			22-Sep
3-511	Better signage clarifying curfew times at Shellridge	Noted			22-Sep
3-512	Restore Tilden Nature Area pony ride (negotiate insurance thru Calif. State Horseman)	Noted	Amelia	Marshall	11-Sep
3-513	More Programs	Noted	Eileen & John	Hofstandt	22-Sep
3-514	Continue Tuesday for the Birds, it's a great program	Noted			29-Sep
3-515	Allow them in the parks	Noted			11-Sep
3-516	More active outreach to seniors to find out and meet needs (ex. Loop trails)	Noted			11-Sep
3-517	Signage indicated connections between parks, trails and BART	Noted			11-Sep
3-518	Need more swim programs for adults, seniors and disabled folks. Pools should stay open longer, or all year, for disabled	Noted	Shirley	Sheffield	11-Sep
3-519	Alternate day uses as an option	Noted			11-Sep
3-520	Better signage on whom yields to whom	Response 3-9			11-Sep
3-521	Do not mix hikers, horses and bikers on single track trails. This is a recipe for conflict.	Noted	Brian	Smalley	11-Sep
3-522	Education for better communication between bikes, horses and dogs for better tolerance.	Response 3-9	Karen	Baskin	11-Sep
3-523	Make trail etiquette common knowledge among bikers, pedestrians, dog owners and equestrians	Response 3-9	Leslie	Floren	11-Sep
3-524	Work to educate for peaceful cohabitation with all park users	Response 3-9			11-Sep
3-525	Equestrian concerned about safety of bikes on single track trails. I have been in a few accidents with bikes coming down at high speeds.	Response 3-9	Shivani	Moraga Horseman	19-Sep
3-526	Trail etiquette reminders more thoroughly posted on multi use trails	Response 3-9	Shivani	Moraga Horseman	19-Sep
3-527	Should protect the safety of trail users by keeping hikers, horses, and bikers on trails suitable for multi use.	Response 3-9	Park User		22-Sep
3-528	Create an advisory multi-use trail council with representatives from trail constituencies (hikers, bikers, dogs, birds, environmentalists)	Response 3-9	Jasper	Hitchen	22-Sep
3-529	Improve trail etiquette education at trailheads and in printed materials	Response 3-9			19-Sep
3-530	Incompatibility between bikes and horses. Single use, single track trails are the only thing that make sense	Response 3-9			19-Sep
3-531	Increase signage and emphasis on staying to the right on trails/general trail etiquette	Response 3-9			22-Sep
3-532	Awareness of all users to yield to the right	Response 3-9			29-Sep
3-533	District should do more to provide trail etiquette	Response 3-9			3-Oct
3-534	Mt. bikes and horses don't mix on narrow trails	Response 3-9			3-Oct
3-535	More trails = less conflicts	Response 3-9			3-Oct
3-536	Appropriate etiquette, designs and behavior should be observed on all trails	Response 3-9			9-Oct
3-537	Provide better safety education about trail etiquette	Response 3-9			9-Oct
3-538	Expand outreach programs to educate all trail users on proper trail etiquette and responsible behavior	Response 3-9	Greg	Haet	12-Oct
3-539	Equestrian riders, bikers, and all park users need to respect other trail users.	Response 3-9	Amy	Arcus	17-Oct
3-540	Manage and increase trails on EBMUD property	Noted	Edwin	Osada	3-Oct

Chapter 3 Related Comments: Access, Interpretation, Recreation and Trails

No.	Comment	Response/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
3-541	More multi use trails on new and existing trails	Noted			19-Sep
3-542	Multi use trails should be compatible for all user groups	Noted			9-Oct
3-543	In support of multi-use trails and willing to help fund to improve safety	Noted			9-Oct
3-544	Need to be more imaginative in providing for multiple uses. Not all activities need to happen in the same place or simultaneously	Noted			29-Sep
3-545	Less multi-use trails. How much use can be sustained without pushing back wildlife, plants and insects.	Noted			11-Sep
3-546	More shared trails	Noted	Michael	Mejiu	3-Oct
3-547	PAC requests the Board consider converting some non-essential fire roads to a narrower trail standard for multi-use.	Response 3-16	PAC		
3-548	More narrow shared use trails	Response 3-9	Nate	Maddox	19-Sep
3-549	Excited to see more shared use narrow trails. Thank you.	Response 3-9	Heather	Day	3-Oct
3-550	Keep some narrow trails for hiking only	Response 3-9			9-Oct
3-551	Limited multi-use of single track trails, consider safety for hoursiders and hikers	Response 3-9			9-Oct
3-552	Preserve many single track trails for hikers and walkers	Response 3-9			9-Oct
3-553	More mixed use narrow trails	Response 3-9	Albert	Reinhardt	9-Oct
3-554	Support the change in the MP to provide more shared-use narrow trails	Response 3-9	William	Martin	10-Sep
3-555	Support proposed change to provide more dedicated and shared use narrow trails	Response 3-9	Tom	Scarvie	7-Sep
3-556	Support for providing more shared use narrow trails, currently drive to Marin County.	Response 3-9	Uros	Seljak	10-Sep
3-557	Support the changes to provide more dedicated and shared use narrow trails	Response 3-9	Weston	Settlemer	19-Sep
3-558	Re-evaluate Ordinance 38 in support of changing demographic needs for trail use	Response 3-9			29-Sep
3-559	Let horse riding groups and biking groups volunteer with trail building	Response 3-9			11-Sep
3-560	Improve line of sight	Response 3-9			19-Sep
3-561	Put terrain in single track trails	Response 3-9			19-Sep
3-562	Don't create single track trails with tractors. Create via repetitive use instead.	Response 3-9			29-Sep
3-563	Advocate for hand build and maintained trails	Response 3-9			3-Oct
3-564	Congrats on the new language for dedicated and shared use trails	Response 3-9			11-Sep
3-565	Interconnect trails as much as possible	Response 3-9			11-Sep
3-566	Keep trail access available to all without restriction. It's everybody's park system	Response 3-9	Rob	Vincent	11-Sep
3-567	Make trails open to all users including dogs	Response 3-9			11-Sep
3-568	More trails for all uses	Response 3-9	Connie	Lavenuiv	11-Sep
3-569	Partner with other large land-owning agencies to expand trail use beyond EBRPD (i.e. EBMUD, PG&E, etc.)	Response 3-9			11-Sep
3-570	Policies for increasing trail access for people/children with autism (no dogs or bikes that disturb quiet enjoyment) Include in ADA policies.	Response 3-9			11-Sep
3-571	Separate trails for hikers and equestrians only	Response 3-9			11-Sep
3-572	Too many trails where you have to use streets to connect	Response 3-9			11-Sep
3-573	Keep trails open for ALL	Response 3-9	Rob	Vincent	11-Sep
3-574	Pay attention to converting existing trails to multi use trails	Response 3-9			11-Sep
3-575	More trails (Brentwood meeting)	Response 3-9	Eileen & John	Hofstandt	22-Sep
3-576	1,000 miles of trails. Not trails for all but trails for a chosen few.	Response 3-9	Chuck	Oliver	19-Sep
3-577	Plan for accessibility trends like electric devices, technical assistive devices and stay ahead of the curve for new and renovating parks	Response 3-9	Eileen & John	Hofstandt	22-Sep
3-578	Alternate days for bikers/equestrians	Response 3-9			19-Sep
3-579	Like the providing a variety of trails for all section. For means "human power" non-motorized	Response 3-9			19-Sep
3-580	Want more trails in local neighborhoods	Response 3-9			19-Sep
3-581	Budget more funds for maintaining existing paved trail system	Response 3-9			22-Sep
3-582	Trails for all users does not mean trails for all uses. To achieve environmental ethic some uses are too destructive and can not be allowed such as OHV	Response 3-9			29-Sep
3-583	Re-evaluate current trail use for true multi-use, including bikes. Not just going forward, but also existing trail systems	Response 3-9			29-Sep
3-584	Increase ongoing trail maintenance. Increase volunteer participation	Response 3-9			29-Sep
3-585	Is there a way for the public to propose new trails and connecting trails	Response 3-9			29-Sep
3-586	Hiking trails for everyone	Response 3-9	Suvesh	Gadad	3-Oct
3-587	Short loop trails near staging areas for children, elderly and disabled	Response 3-9	Suresh	Gadad	3-Oct
3-588	I hike and would like to see more foot trails preserved for same.	Response 3-9			3-Oct
3-589	Attached to the comment card is a list of suggested new trails at Del Valle, Sunol and Morgan Territory	Response 3-9	Werner	Schlapfer	3-Oct
3-590	Trails for all should not endorse uses that are very destructive to natural resources.	Response 3-9	Bill	Hunt	3-Oct

Chapter 3 Related Comments: Access, Interpretation, Recreation and Trails

No.	Comment	Response/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
3-591	Suggested a trail along West Side of Lake Del Valle from Deer Jaw trail to Dam. Etc., etc.	Response 3-9	Werner	Schlapfer	3-Oct
3-592	Suggested 3 new trails in Sunol 1) west side of Flag Hill 2) over the plateau below west side of Flag Hill 3) From Flag Hill to Welch Creek Rd. etc. etc etc	Response 3-9	Werner	Schlapfer	3-Oct
3-593	Suggested 2 new trails at Morgan Territory 1) old Finley to Sulphur Springs trail 2) Hog Canyon to Eagle and Bay Creek Trails etc. etc	Response 3-9	Werner	Schlapfer	3-Oct
3-594	New trails should not result in degradation of natural resources	Response 3-9			3-Oct
3-595	Like idea of more multi-use trails but have wide range of abilities and challenges	Response 3-9			3-Oct
3-596	More beginner and intermediate trails for kids and more challenging trails designed with mt. bikes in mind but not limited to bikes	Response 3-9			3-Oct
3-597	More hiking trails	Response 3-9			3-Oct
3-598	Focus on closing trail gaps and open walking paths early in the process to provide access a.s.a.p.	Response 3-9			3-Oct
3-599	Accessible does not mean paved	Response 3-9			9-Oct
3-600	More natural, hand work on trail maintenance rather than heavy equipment	Response 3-9			9-Oct
3-601	Walking trails	Response 3-9	Ellen	Barth	9-Oct
3-602	Love to hike in the parks	Response 3-9	Paula	Zurowski	9-Oct
3-603	Provide recreational leadership by advocating for recreational trail access through conservation areas	Response 3-9			22-Sep
3-604	Convince others to provide trails. For example PG&E, So Bay Aqueduct, water districts, in conservation areas	Response 3-9	Beverly	Lane	9-Oct
3-605	Please make some trails with switchbacks since some are too steep	Response 3-9	Mary Ann	Hannon	21-Oct
3-606	Be more proactive in partnering with transit services, especially during summer months	Noted			?
3-607	Provide bus service to hiking groups and seniors	Noted			19-Sep
3-608	BART-EBRPD collaboration to install signs for connections between parks, trails and BART	Noted	Robert Raburn	BART	26-Sep
3-609	Certain groups are more "team" recreational users. Individualized activities may be more underrepresented i.e bikers/OHV users	Noted			29-Sep
3-610	Personalized watercraft (jet skis) should not be allowed due to noise and pollution	Noted			29-Sep
3-611	Continue allowing motorized wheelchairs	Noted			29-Sep
3-612	Happy that the District is fostering Youth	Response 3-17	Nancy	Delaney	11-Sep
3-613	Expand children's programs. More promotion through preschools.	Response 3-17			3-Oct
3-614	Reach out to and incorporate younger groups in trail development and mt. biking in particular so they are invested in the park system and help reduce illegal trails	Response 3-17			3-Oct
3-615	District needs to provide recreation for younger groups. People 15-25 years of age are badly overlooked.	Response 3-17			3-Oct

Chapter 4 Related Comments: Planning, Land Acquisition, Parkland Designation and Development

No.	Comment	Response/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
4-1	The District will notify the public...of plans, including designs for construction of major new facilities, and the scheduled.....	Response 4-1	Bruce	Beyaert	2-Oct
4-2	The District will notify.....about publications and plans, including proposed design of major new facilities, and the scheduled times for public....	Noted	PAC		
4-3	KEP3 "minimize the impact" changed to "avoid impact", "minimize is not strong enough language	Response 4-3			22-Sep
4-4	KEP3 "mitigation" sends wrong message, broader language should be used. District should "prevent" or "avoid" damages, not mitigate them	Response 4-3			22-Sep
4-5	Use the word avoid impacts again. Don't even hint that mitigation of natural resource damage rather than avoidance is acceptable.	Response 4-3	Regional Parks	Association	21-Sep
4-6identify important resources in parklands and develop recommendations for <u>avoiding impact to them or if necessary to mitigate for this impact protecting them</u> . The park planning process will consider the needs toprotection recommendations. To minimize the impact to identified resources- or if necessary, to mitigate for this impact	Response 4-3	Amy	Arcus	17-Oct
4-7	PAC would like to emphasize the importance of these policies since opportunities for partnerships can sometimes be missed unless staff to staff and board to board relationships are established and maintained with cities, counties and other special districts.	Noted	PAC		
4-8	PRPT 28 and 29 restrict the future installation of infrastructure such as utility lines or communications facilities on District lands. A majority of the PAC requests the Board consider the unintended consequences resulting from a policy that might exclude new technology which could be beneficial to the	Response 4-8	PAC		
4-9	Acquire property and leave wild or w/minimal hiking	Response 4-4	Connie	Laventuiv	11-Sep
4-10	Don't buy more property until existing peoperties can be maintained safely	Response 4-4	Judith	Martin	11-Sep
4-11	Grateful the District acquired McCosker Ranch and Indian Valley.	Noted			11-Sep
4-12	Thank you for buying McCosker Ranch and Indian Valley	Noted	Sylvia	Finger	11-Sep
4-13	More Parkland (works for City of San Ramon)	Noted	Shinei	Tsakamoto	11-Sep
4-14	Establish a funding mechanism for acq/dev for Murray Township (East Alameda County)	Noted			19-Sep
4-15	Need more parks in Eastern Alameda County including Tesla	Noted			19-Sep
4-16	Is it financially prudent to pursue properties for acquisition that will ultimately lead to litigation?	Noted			22-Sep
4-17	Purchase are at best value, based on price and non-price factors and info on land purchases are available to the public	Noted	Jo Ann	Lew	29-Sep
4-18	Habitat preservation and protection of sensitive and rare species should be #1 priority in Acquisition and Land Management	Response 4-4			29-Sep
4-19	Good to buy land when have opportunity and o.k. to leave in land bank until it's financially prudent to open it to the public	Response 4-4			3-Oct
4-20	Consider a new operting agreement with Bethany Reservoir like that of Del Valle. Could sue some impovement and could benefit Livermore and Byron	Noted	Walter	Freeman	22-Sep
4-21	Protect and clean-up the islands, possible volunteer project. Signs telling people to keep the islands clean	Noted			22-Sep
4-22	Use fish shaped bike rack for kayak dolly storage	Noted			22-Sep
4-23	Provide opportunities for writing classes at BB VC for adults and children	Noted			22-Sep
4-24	Add a veladrome	Noted			11-Sep
4-25	Bike parks like in Park City Utah, creates revenue	Noted			11-Sep
4-26	Build a dirt jump park	Noted			11-Sep
4-27	Create high speed training tracks (single track trails) for competitive training	Noted			11-Sep
4-28	Create bicycle pump track at Marciel gate (with existing dirt mounds)	Noted			29-Sep
4-29	Consider bike park at Marciel Gate at Chabot	Noted			3-Oct
4-30	At lease one IMBA compliant trail per park.	Response 4-5	Joe	Floren	11-Sep
4-31	Every park should have a safe I.M.B.A. certified trail circuit	Response 4-5	Sandy	Flores	11-Sep
4-32	Every park should have a safe I.M.B.A. certified trail circuit	Response 4-5	Leslie	Floren	11-Sep
4-33	More IMBA certified trails	Response 4-5			11-Sep
4-34	Provide funds for the development of IMBA quality trails.	Response 4-5	Greg	Blardino	3-Oct
4-35	International Mountain Biking Association Guidelines	Response 4-5			19-Sep
4-36	Would someone address the star thistle at Briones, it's taking over	Noted	Beverly	Lane	9-Oct
4-37	Private land prevents hikers from going from Los Vaqueros to Brushy Peak, must climb over the fence	Noted	Beverly	Lane	9-Oct
4-38	Open to the public	Noted	Beverly	Lane	9-Oct
4-39	Consider appropriate placement of cell tower for safety purposes	Noted			9-Oct
4-40	Pleased with sand restoration planned for Crown Beach	Noted	Jane	Cormier	11-Sep
4-41	Thank you for restoring the area. She operates the windsurfing concession there	Noted	Jane	Cormier	11-Sep
4-42	Loop atrail around Lake Del Valle	Noted			3-Oct
4-43	Complete trail on West side of Del Valle	Noted			3-Oct
4-44	Lake of water was a State staff snaffoo; don't let them get away with that	Noted	Beverly	Lane	9-Oct
4-45	EBRPD would be appropriate agency to tell the story of water mgmt, Delta habitat.	Noted			3-Oct

Chapter 4 Related Comments: Planning, Land Acquisition, Parkland Designation and Development

No.	Comment	Response/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
4-46	State spent \$14 billion on Delta water tunnel project. Needs to include EBRPD involvement to explain habitat, water supply issues (get grants from State)	Noted			3-Oct
4-47	Partner with State H2O project to help tell the Delta story	Noted			11-Sep
4-48	Walking/biking trails could use more bathrooms and drinking fountains	Noted	G	Itaya	22-Sep
4-49	Would like to receive maps of Ukrania area in Garin, when will Garin have access to Walpert Ridge and 5 Canyons trails system?	Noted	Robert	Bean	29-Sep
4-50	Develop more cross-country trails in Garin and Dry Creek (on contour)	Noted			29-Sep
4-51	Account for use of materials that are removed from parks (e.g. recycling, sustainability) xreference Green Paris	Noted			11-Sep
4-52	Do not use synthetic rubber for landing zones in playgrounds	Noted			11-Sep
4-53	Green is good (from City of Oakland Parks & Rec. Commissioner)	Noted	Mandolin	Redmond	11-Sep
4-54	Expand green initiative to include sustainable business practices for water/energy conservatin/material re-use (e.g. use non-potable water for golf, lawns, playfields and reuse wood chips in parks and solar panels in parking lots for energy and shade)	Noted			29-Sep
4-55	Work with local agencies/municipalities to finance imporvements to the Iron Horse Trail	Noted			3-Oct
4-56	Access to land bank property	Response 4-4	Martha	Martin	22-Sep
4-57	Landbank land should be opened for hiking soon after acquisition, maybe to recognized groups on a permit basis	Response 4-4	Warner	Schlapfer	3-Oct
4-58	Open land banked property for hiking by permit	Response 4-4			3-Oct
4-59	Open land banked property by permit	Response 4-4			3-Oct
4-60	Should be opened on demand for recognized hiking groups	Response 4-4			3-Oct
4-61	More public input into opening up landbanked properties. Can citizens form groups to help finance opening sooner e.g. grants, sweat equity.	Response 4-4			3-Oct
4-62	Open land bank for hiking for organized groups	Response 4-4			3-Oct
4-63	Prioritize maintenance of existing facilities over development of new facilities	Noted	Jo Ann	Lew	29-Sep
4-64	PAC: Page 92, 5th dot under Use Designations in Specific Classifications - motorized vehicles is prohibited on Unless they conform to the to the <u>Board approved</u> definition With imparied mobility <u>as delineated in the District Policy on Mobility Access.</u>	Response 4-7	PAC		
4-65	Is there flexibility to acquire land not identified in the Master Plan?	Noted			11-Sep
4-66	How does M.P. process compliment SB375 and sustainable communities strategy?	Noted			29-Sep
4-67	M.P. update should be reviewed under CEQA, it is a project	Response 4-2	Gino	Altamirano	3-Oct
4-68	Check with cities in East Bay regarding their MP and zoning so all agencies can be congruent before finalizing out plan. Be proactive.	Noted			3-Oct
4-69	Will CEQA be followed?	Response 4-2			9-Oct
4-70	Hang gliders the land place is seperated from hikers, please keep it this way when planning the new staging area	Noted	Karl	Allmendinger	11-Sep
4-71	Parking area C has Ohlone artifacts. Would like Ohlone involved in preservation and would like interpretive display	Noted	Karl	Allmendinger	11-Sep
4-72	If/when the parking lots are build chareg \$2 for up to 4 hours to park to encourage car pooling and discourage non park users from parking there	Noted	Suresh	Bazaj	29-Sep
4-73	Landslide Possibility	Noted			29-Sep
4-74	Parking fees at Mission peak when/if new parking lot	Noted			29-Sep
4-75	Why were the barriers to bootlegged trails removed	Noted			29-Sep
4-76	Too crowded. Impacting environment. Need a plan to reduce # of users and to protect the land	Noted			29-Sep
4-77	Noise standards at parks, for example OHV activities at Tesla	Noted			3-Oct
4-78	Bike park at Oyster Bay (trail or mountain type bikes)	Noted			29-Sep
4-79	Quit trying to create native plant museums on former dumps and landfill such as Berkeley Meadow and Oyster Bay. Wildlife does not benefit from the destruction of non-native habitat to which they are adapted. Native plants are not adapted to the soil, air, and climate conditions of these altered places.	Noted			29-Sep
4-80	Sufficient parking at facilities, esp. when there are large groups or special events	Noted	Jo Ann	Lew	29-Sep
4-81	When planning a park, include trail access to the park in the planning process.	Noted			3-Oct
4-82	Open Kilkare to public or weld closed	Noted			19-Sep
4-83	Want to be notified when land in Palomares Canyon is going to be developed i.e. where will staging areas and trailheads be.	Noted	Roy & Mary Ann	Fernandez	3-Oct
4-84	Open Kilkare Rd.	Noted			3-Oct
4-85	Need access to Pleasanton Ridge, currently land banked	Noted			3-Oct
4-86	Add staging areas at end of Finley Rd and end of Kilkare Rd.	Noted			3-Oct
4-87	Staging area needed at the end of Finley and Kilkare Rd.	Noted			3-Oct

Chapter 4 Related Comments: Planning, Land Acquisition, Parkland Designation and Development

No.	Comment	Response/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
4-88	Sinbad Canyon trail not accessible, why?	Noted			3-Oct
4-89	Needs northern access	Noted			3-Oct
4-90	Open the entrance at Kilcare rd. Park should not have private entrances.	Noted			3-Oct
4-91	The District should buy Pt. Isabel, the lease expires in 2023.	Noted			9-Oct
4-92	Thank Pt. Isabel rangers for recent mowing, Fox tails	Noted			9-Oct
4-93	Keep dogs only at Pt. Isabel	Noted			9-Oct
4-94	Loves camping and kayaking at Pt. Pinole	Noted			9-Oct
4-95	Bicycle connection between Livermore/Tracy (Corral Hollow Corridor)	Noted			11-Sep
4-96	Continue to promote and develop links to and between parks for bikes	Response 4-6			22-Sep
4-97	Promote safe cycling connectors between parks	Response 4-6			9-Oct
4-98	Expand connections to urban areas and between parks to better facilitate travel by bike	Response 4-6	Greg	Haet	12-Oct
4-99	Add San Leandro Creek between MLK, Bay Trail and Lake Chabot. Will be the 1st trail connector between Bay Trail and Ridge Trail. She lists several reasons why this trail is a good idea	Noted	Robin	Freeman	12-Oct
4-100	Expand Ridge Trail -Tesla park	Noted			19-Sep
4-101	Would like to open easement near Washington Manor area that would provide access to Bay Trail and Marina park	Noted			11-Sep
4-102	Connect Brushy Peak, Tesla Pas,s Cedar Mt and Del Valle	Noted			3-Oct
4-103	Ridgeline extension from Del Valle to Morgan Territory	Noted			3-Oct
4-104	Trail around tri-valley area linking all parks (would include tesla)	Noted			3-Oct
4-105	Continue to link parks with trails	Noted			3-Oct
4-106	Want regional trail from Morgan Territory to Brushy Peak to Tesla to Del Valle	Noted			3-Oct
4-107	Would like a trail connection between MT and Tesla	Noted			3-Oct
4-108	Add connector trails from Cedar Mt. to Tesla to Brushy Peak	Noted			11-Sep
4-109	Oakland, San Leandro and Emeryville need more connector trails	Noted	Wendy	Wheeler	11-Sep
4-110	Partner with State and open So. Bay aquaduct trail	Noted			11-Sep
4-111	Extend CC Canal trail north over S.R.4 to BNSF Row and connect Easterly to Iron Horse, would utilize mostly public lands, great loop	Noted	John	Mercurio	19-Sep
4-112	Diablo Crest Mt. Bike/Hike trail from Mt. Diablo to Tesla	Noted			19-Sep
4-113	Develop trail corridor between Brushy Peak, Tesla, Cedar Mountain and Del Valle	Noted			19-Sep
4-114	Create a Diablo Crest Trail from Tesla to Mt. Diablo	Noted			19-Sep
4-115	Regional trail connection Brushy Peak, Tesla, Cedar Mt., Del Valle	Noted			3-Oct
4-116	Make sure Bay Ridge trail is continuously open for cyclists so travel through Bay Area	Noted			9-Oct
4-117	Continue Eastern trail system to go from Ohlone to Brushy with Tesla along route	Noted			9-Oct
4-118	Close the gaps on existing regional trails	Noted			9-Oct
4-119	Provide safe trail connections between parks	Noted			9-Oct
4-120	Del Valle connection to Tesla a long with Brushy Peak	Noted			9-Oct
4-121	Beautification of the Richmond greenway	Noted			9-Oct
4-122	Plan for sea level rise and impacts on shoreline parks	Noted			19-Sep
4-123	Don't overspend to address "potential" of sea level rise	Noted			19-Sep
4-124	Complex that combines recreation with sports like the one in City of Pleasanton	Noted			11-Sep
4-125	Would like some sort of structure at Sunol to use for school programs on rainy days	Noted	Mary Ann	Hannon	21-Oct
4-126	Open now for hikers	Noted			29-Sep
4-127	Open to hiking even before there is parking	Noted			29-Sep
4-128	Be more forthcoming about when it will open. We were teased about is Plan but never hear anything about it or timelie	Noted			29-Sep

Chapter 5 Related Comments: Human/Financial Resources, Public Service, Outreach and Inclusion

No.	Comment	Response/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
5-1	... and conservation agencies, resource science, and community groups.	Response 5-1		CNPS	21-Nov
5-2	Comment JR8: this is where better signage would be useful, for example, on the coastal prairie at Pt. Pinole—it might help people to better grasp the values of it, and appreciate it more with informative and interesting signage. Comment JR9: Also, the value of contiguous healthy native eco-systems, with their associated plants, birds, amphibians mammals, etc. cannot be overstated, especially in information and teaching settings.	Noted		CNPS	21-Nov
5-3	Don't delete volunteer language from Master Plan	Response 5-2			3-Oct
5-4	I would like to see the District keep / emphasize the phrase public employee workforce as an important component and reflection of the reality that we are using public funds to provide people with a living wage and defined benefits in exchange for serving and protection the public commons.	Noted	Amy	Coulter	31-Oct
5-5	Per Susan Gonzales, the Union noted the phrase public employee was replaced with motivated employees. She explained it to them and they were okay but then didn't understand why we needed to describe employees as "motivated" employees	Noted	Local 2428		10-Oct
5-6	Policy should specify we want skilled public employees and volunteers, concessionaires etc should be mentioned	Noted	Bob	Branstrom	11-Sep
5-7	Why remove reference to "skilled public workforce"?	Noted			11-Sep
5-8	Why was HR2 policy changed to remove reference to volunteers, contractors, concessionaires	Noted			11-Sep
5-9	Keep reference to skilled public employees in policy HR2	Noted			9-Oct
5-10	Since PAC questions having a marksmanship range, change HR4 to: Concessionaires are businesses that use District facilities to provide services or activities that the District could not otherwise provide. Concessionaires typically provide some revenue to the District, although the amount may be nominal, depending on the type of service provided. Based on market conditions, financial records, quality of service, public benefit and experience at the facility, the District may change the operational mode of a service between a concession and an in-house operation, as needed. Concessionaires must provide services in keeping with environmental standards and park values. The District modifies or discontinues a concessionaire's services should the services not be consistent with the District's goals.	Noted	PAC		
5-11	Comment JR11: Would be informative to see the current approximate staffing levels (as of a certain date) and goals for future staffing levels.	Noted		CNPS	21-Nov
5-12	Would love to have Citizens' advisory committee (Brentwood Park Commissioner)	Noted	Brentwood Park	Commissioner	22-Sep
5-13	Re-active East County Advisory Comm. Work with Pitts/Antioch/Oakley/Brentwood	Noted			19-Sep
5-14	Revise Citizens Advisory Committee with East County	Noted			22-Sep
5-15	Support a citizen's advisory council to advise on land use issues	Noted			9-Oct
5-16	The Board needs to be more visible and accessible. Brochures need every Board member's contact info, currently they are too vague	Noted	Advocate for PWDs	Frail & Elderly	19-Sep
5-17	Coalitions between user groups (dog owners/cyclists/equestrians)	Noted			9-Oct
5-18	The M.P. would benefit from establishing some mechanism for hearing feedback from interest groups.	Noted	Sally	Germain	19-Sep
5-19	Access to programs via informational meetings and parks is limited in East CCC, keep more coming	Noted	Eileen & John	Hofstandt	22-Sep
5-20	Need more connection with residents out here (Brentwood Park Commissioner)	Noted	Brentwood Park	Commissioner	22-Sep
5-21	Share info. To build community, state of natural resources (results) and effectiveness of policies. Is it working?	Noted			3-Oct
5-22	District should share info re. resources, inventories thereof and relationship to mgmt policies	Noted			3-Oct
5-23	Hire more minorities in the main office and operations to reflect diversity of Ala and CC counties. This will encourage more minorities to come to parks.	Noted			9-Oct
5-24	Increase diversity of staff through training, hiring and education to broaden perspective	Noted			9-Oct
5-25	Entry fees are affordable to middle, low and very low income residents	Noted	Jo Ann	Lew	29-Sep
5-26	Free entry to walkers, bicyclists and seniors	Noted	Jo Ann	Lew	29-Sep
5-27	EBRPD must remain public/not privatized and accessible to all and affordable (free/tax supported)	Noted			11-Sep
5-28	Not sure what standard policy has been set in place by the stakeholder authorities regarding consideration of energy, water, and long term operations and maintenance costs when vetting competing investment opportunities for park capital funds. If life cycle costing has not been considered into the budget review process there is information available for consideration	Noted	Virginia	Waik	27-Sep
5-29	What about homeless?	Noted	Joseph	Partansky	19-Sep
5-30	Comment JR10: Would be nice to have ongoing training for public safety staff in the location of and values of natural resources in the parks, and for the best management practices of resources in their care.	Noted		CNPS	21-Nov
5-31	Live web cams in parks to share activities and live action	Noted			29-Sep
5-32	How does EBRPD do their marketing?	Noted			29-Sep
5-33	Marketing info on becoming annual member of EBRPD needed (mainly at park entrances and bulletin boards and on trail maps)	Noted			29-Sep
5-34	Page 103 Park Advisory Committee: The section describing the PAC should be amended to include the labor representative on the committee and include that one of the annual recommendations it makes is on Parkland Dedications.	Noted	PAC		
5-35	Incorporate use of electric vehicles in the Master Plan	Noted			11-Sep
5-36	Thank you for all your consideration to make the parks/trails a place of community	Noted	Marie-Jo	Graziadei	11-Sep
5-37	Continue to encourage more participation from the public in your work and decision making	Noted	Tom	Scarvie	7-Sep

Chapter 5 Related Comments: Human/Financial Resources, Public Service, Outreach and Inclusion

No.	Comment	Response/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
5-38	Respect Native American voices and make an advisory board composed of indigenous native americans to decide upon the fate of their historic sacred land	Noted	Andrea	Barrera	9-Oct
5-39	We need an advisory board with native voices. Please respect native land	Noted	Annerys	Vasquez	9-Oct
5-40	Should commit to convening an advisory board of local indigenous people to oversee decision making process pertaining to their sacred land	Noted	George	Cammarota	9-Oct
5-41	Support of EBRPD upholding native requests to uphold an indigenous advisory board so native sites are protected and honored	Noted	Viola		9-Oct
5-42	Create advisory board of local native people to be consulted on land acquisition and use issues	Noted			9-Oct
5-43	Establish a local native advisory board that works to protect sacred sites	Noted			9-Oct
5-44	Advisory Board honoring native voices and protecting sacred sites	Noted			9-Oct
5-45	Ask native peoples what process they want to develop partnerships and advisory body (2 people)	Noted			9-Oct
5-46	Develop a specific process for including descendants of indigenous people in decision making.	Noted	Julie	Bongers	11-Sep
5-47	Glad to see the statements showing there is interest in consulting Native Americans to preserve the cultural heritage.	Noted			11-Sep
5-48	Native people need to be consulted about what is culturally sensitive	Noted	Amanda	Bloom	11-Sep
5-49	Would like to see more input, primarily from original inhabitants, Ohlone should help develop policies	Noted	Louis	Dunlap	11-Sep
5-50	Get input for decisions about land use	Noted	Amy	Hutto	11-Sep
5-51	EBRPD should respect and seek input from them. Their knowledge is relevant to all of the priority issues.	Noted		Mattson	11-Sep
5-52	Elevate involvement of BLM advisory role, Resource Advisory Council	Noted			11-Sep
5-53	Inclusion in resource management policies and methods	Noted			11-Sep
5-54	Involve in decision making, protect sacred sites	Noted	John	Moran	11-Sep
5-55	Involve them early on regarding cultural resources	Noted			11-Sep
5-56	M.P. does not properly involve natives in preservation of their cultural resources	Noted	Sioux	Messinger	12-Sep
5-57	EBRPD: listen to and include Native voices	Noted			11-Sep
5-58	Seriously listen to the Ohlone people	Noted	Anthony	Sul	11-Sep
5-59	Share the knowledge of the Ohlone people	Noted	Anthony	Sul	11-Sep
5-60	Listen to the local native americans regarding cultural resource management	Noted	Julie	Hernandez	11-Sep
5-61	Listen to native voices. Be kind enough to invite Native peoples on the Board. Their wisdom would benefit everyone.	Noted	Evelie	Posch	9-Oct
5-62	Listen to native voices	Noted	Nick		9-Oct
5-63	Listen to and include native voices	Noted			9-Oct
5-64	Listen to native voices. For equity sake, be kind enough to invite native first peoples on the Board	Noted			9-Oct
5-65	Listen to include Native voices.	Noted			9-Oct
5-66	Listen to native voices	Noted	R.	Brown	9-Oct
5-67	Listen to native voices	Noted	Mishwa	Lee	9-Oct
5-68	Include native voices PROMINENTLY in the Master Plan. Meaningful consultation needs to be a priority.	Noted	Vincent	Medina	11-Sep
5-69	Tribal members want to be included and consulted in development of the Master Plan	Noted			11-Sep
5-70	Requesting a meeting with Mr. Dotson, Corrina Gould, Mayor McLaughlin, Michele K., Gino-Chumash and Courtney Cummings	Noted	Courtney	Cummings	15-Oct
5-71	Have Park Advisory Committee member(s) appointed by the Native American Community	Noted			9-Oct
5-72	District consult w/Natives re amount of access, real partnership, face-to-face, real dialogue, respect	Noted			11-Sep
5-73	Develop partnership. Reference under partnerships *indigenous local peoples and under mgt stds	Noted			11-Sep
5-74	Develop productive partnership, active participation, respect as we would any other religious site	Noted			11-Sep
5-75	Local native people should be included in any and all land use decisions	Noted		Indian People Organizing for Change	11-Sep
5-76	Partner with, honor and respect Native Americans, don't just "accommodate" them	Noted	Diane	Williams	11-Sep
5-77	Preserve spiritual quality of the land. Structure relationship-equal part of process, partnership with indigenous people	Noted			11-Sep
5-78	Partnership with them, listen especially to Corrina Goutel	Noted	Nancy	Delaney	11-Sep
5-79	Board, PAC, staff, etc. must have representatives from East Bay Area Native American Communities	Noted		Mattson	11-Sep
5-80	Comment JR12: Are there representatives from natural resource groups on the PAC? Are there individuals with special experience in land management and/or eco-systems management on the PAC? Are there any environmental or resource science groups that nominate candidates for the PAC?	Noted		CNPS	21-Nov
5-81	Would like to see credit card parking meters at the regional parks (reduce need for exact cash)	Noted	Lynn	Ryan	3-Oct

Chapter 5 Related Comments: Human/Financial Resources, Public Service, Outreach and Inclusion

No.	Comment	Response/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
5-82	Work on partnerships to connect EBRPD lands to S. Joaquin County and protect Tracy Hills	Noted			22-Sep
5-83	Support socially engaging communities of park users, this will create inclusive park experiences and promote mental and physical health	Noted			9-Oct
5-84	There is an enormous potential for the District to foster green partnerships to develop and offer increasingly popular hands-on workshops and/or volunteer projects in agroforestry, urban food forests, permaculture design, watershed restoration, reforestation, low-stress handling animal husbandry, etc.	Noted	Amy	Coulter	31-Oct
5-85	Encourage partnerships w/local colleges and universities for research and outdoor class use	Noted			11-Sep
5-86	Partner with Brentwood more. Engage our services and residents	Noted	Eileen & John	Hofstandt	22-Sep
5-87	Reactivate far East County Advisory Committee for citizen involvement (Contra Costa). He works for City of Brentwood	Noted	Craig	Bronzan	19-Sep
5-88	Reach out to local park and rec Department for joint Healthy Parks/Healthy People program	Noted	Craig	Bronzan	19-Sep
5-89	Partner with our cities for more exposure out here (East CCC)	Noted	Eileen & John	Hofstandt	22-Sep
5-90	Partner with local parks & rec to clarify healthy parks healthy people and promote	Noted			19-Sep
5-91	Partner with the State water project to tell the water story and complete the South Bay Aquaduct Trail	Noted			19-Sep
5-92	More university/college/school research collaboration (cultural/scientific)	Noted			19-Sep
5-93	Partner with State Water Project to tell the values of Dealta at Big Break and South Bak Aquaduct trail	Noted			22-Sep
5-94	Increase partnerships with cities	Noted			22-Sep
5-95	Continue and expand the District's excellent partnerships w/volunteer organizations for trail maintenance and patrol	Noted	Greg	Haet	12-Oct
5-96	Partner with Ala Co., Livermore, Tri-Valley Conservancy, Save Mt. Diablo, CNPS of East Bay, Zone 7, CA Fish & Wildlife, Corps of Engineers, Dept of Fish & Wildlife, etc to acquire, get easement on, property so this nearly gone habitat is protected and preserved in perpetuity.	Noted	Mary Ann	Hannon	21-Oct
5-97	Would like to see increased police at remote parks like Round Valley, more frequent presence.	Noted	Lynn	Ryan	3-Oct
5-98	Charge entrance fee to use in development of shared community resources and programs to foster use of parks by all users	Noted			11-Sep
5-99	EBRPD needs to maintain facilities so they are safe for users.	Noted	Judi	Martin	11-Sep
5-100	Facilities maintained at a safe standard regardless of funding	Noted			11-Sep
5-101	Facilities should be maintained to safe standards, specifically Skyline Rhanch roof. More emphasis on maintenance and safety	Noted			11-Sep
5-102	Sateline office in far East County. He works for City of Brentwood	Noted	Craig	Bronzan	19-Sep

Chapter 6 Related Comments: Key Challenges, Budget and Master Plan Map

No.	Comment	Map Revised/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
6-1	The budget booked indicates it will cost \$150K to replace 10 toilets at Anthony Chabot, is that correct? Please explain	Noted	Andrea	Altschulor	11-Sep
6-2	Public policy makers need to be willing to do something about the correlation between increasing levels of human-generated atmospheric greenhouse gases and catastrophic global weather events.	Noted	Amy	Coulter	31-Oct
6-3	Comment JR13: We don't yet fully understand the impact that climate change will have on the vegetation/native plant communities. We do know that swings in heat and cold, precipitation, periods of drought will become more frequent and extreme. How this will effect the flowering patterns, and health of the plants, and associated invertebrate and vertebrate fauna and all the other creatures in the chain has yet to be seen. When this factor of climate change is added to other existing threats to the health of eco-systems and plant communities, such as weed invasion and competition, diseases (such as SOD), the human encroachment and development, it becomes more important than ever to steward our	Noted		CNPS	21-Nov
6-4	Add completed trail sections within Point Pinole Regional Shoreline	Noted	Bruce	Beyaert	2-Oct
6-5	Add Class I along Richmond Pky between Wildcat Reek Trail and Goodrick with gap remaining along Goodrick btn Pky and Breuner Marsh	Noted	Bruce	Beyaert	2-Oct
6-6	Add Landfill Loop and Wildcat Marsh Trails w/gap on south side of San Pablo Creek between Wildcat Marsh Trail and Richmond Pky Bay Trail	Map Revised	Bruce	Beyaert	2-Oct
6-7	Update with regard to Richmond Greenway	Map Revised	Bruce	Beyaert	2-Oct
6-8	Add completed section between Marina Bay and Garrad Blvd	Map Revised	Bruce	Beyaert	2-Oct
6-9	Show completed sections within Miller/Knox and leading to Cutting Blvd via Dornan Dr. Tunnel	Map Revised	Bruce	Beyaert	2-Oct
6-10	Add Shipyard 3 Trail w/connection to Brickyard Cove Rd. wich will be build soon, to provide a connecton with Ferry Point	Map Revised	Bruce	Beyaert	2-Oct
6-11	Consider adding planned trail sections along Rheem Creek	Noted	Bruce	Beyaert	2-Oct
6-12	Consider adding planned trail sections south from Breuner Bay Trail at Goodrick Ave along shoreline to Landfill Loop stagina area and Wildcat	Noted	Bruce	Beyaert	2-Oct
6-13	Consider adding planned trail extending the Bay Trail section on the south side of San Pablo Creek upstream from Richmond Pky	Noted	Bruce	Beyaert	2-Oct
6-14	Map on page 96 should included Great CA Delta Trail	Map Revised	PAC		
6-15	Add the San Leandro Creek Greenway to the Master Plan. It's a 6.3 mile trail that would connect Chabot and MLK shoreline.	Noted	Wendy	Wheeler	11-Sep
6-16	Add potential trail connections on map: 1) extend CC Trail NE to connect with Iron Horse near Pacheco, 2) Connect CA Riding and Hiking to Concord Weapons from Newhall park. Also, request Board to place priority on developing east-west trails across the East Bay Hills.	Noted	PAC		
6-17	Would like south of Bishop Ranch land to be included in M.P. 2012	Noted			11-Sep
6-18	Impressed and pleased with 2012 M.P. Support inclusion of Tesla as potential preserve. Recommend preserving it for low impact, non-motorized.	Noted	Marilyn	Russell	3-Oct
6-19	Should continue to include Chain of Lakes in M.P. map for future	Noted			3-Oct
6-20	Keep Chain of Lakes on M.P.	Map Revised			3-Oct
6-21	Is there text info. regarding Juan Bautista de Anza tail route in the M.P.	Map Revised	Lisa	Borba	20-Sep
6-22	pages 75 and 96 have references to the Great San Joaquin Delta Trail which may be a misprint and mean to state the Great California Delta Trail.	Map Revised	Delta Protection	Commission	11-Oct
6-23	Include allowable uses and show connections to other parks	Noted			11-Sep
6-24	The map doesn't show the new highway and route from Antioch through Brentwood that has been open for 3 years, updt the map.	Map Revised	Craig	Banzon	19-Sep
6-25	Highway 4 on the map needs to be updated to show the bypass	Map Revised	Brendwood Park	Commissioner	22-Sep
6-26	Coordinate local and regional maps esp. in far East County	Noted			19-Sep
6-27	PAC supports adding Mangini Ranch and Franklin Canyon, Rancho Pinole to the list of potential parks.	Noted	PAC		
6-28	PAC requests the Board review the list of potential parklands proposed for removal, in particular parks listed on Measure WW or where there are expectations by local constituencies (Delta Recreation Area Jersey Island, Chain of Lakes, Alvarado Wetlands).	Noted	PAC		
6-29	Would like Tesla be used for dirt bikes since they don't have many places to go	Noted	Nicole	Vernon	17-Oct
6-30	State owned and environmental studies show the land is not condusive to OHV use. Maybe joint operation between State and EBRPD	Noted			22-Sep
6-31	Partner with Carnegie to manage Tesla for multiple uses, including OHV	Noted			9-Oct
6-32	Bought with OHV trust funds. Take it off your map	Noted			11-Sep
6-33	Concerned EBRPD is wasting time trying to acquire Tesla. State property can not mix with Regional park property	Noted			11-Sep
6-34	Do not waste money and time trying to acquire Tesla	Noted			11-Sep
6-35	Don't waste time and money to acquire Tesla property	Noted			11-Sep
6-36	Improperly included on Master Plan map, purched with OHV trust fund \$ to add to Carnegie	Noted			11-Sep
6-37	Keep for OHV use	Noted			11-Sep
6-38	Leave it for OHV	Noted	Carnegie	Forever	11-Sep
6-39	Not for sale, should be opened for OHV use, have been waiting 20 years	Noted			11-Sep
6-40	Remove from the Master Plan	Noted			11-Sep
6-41	Take it off the map, need more OHV opportunities, fastr growing and revenue neutral	Noted			11-Sep
6-42	The property was purchased by the State with OHV funds for the purpose of OHV use.	Noted			11-Sep
6-43	Use for OHV	Noted	Mark	Fagerroos	11-Sep
6-44	for OHV	Noted	Kevin	Moore	11-Sep

Chapter 6 Related Comments: Key Challenges, Budget and Master Plan Map

No.	Comment	Map Revised/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
6-45	Illegal for EBRPD to try and take over the property	Noted	Chuck	Oliver	11-Sep
6-46	Leave available for OHV	Noted	Will	Schultz	11-Sep
6-47	Part of Carnegie, open it to OHV use	Noted			11-Sep
6-48	Remove from the Mater Plan and direct the funds to local populated concerns.	Noted	Chuck	Below	11-Sep
6-49	Should remain under the State	Noted			11-Sep
6-50	Stay out of Tesla	Noted	Kevin	Puent	11-Sep
6-51	Tesla, leave it alone	Noted	Jerry	Fouts	11-Sep
6-52	You can't legally make Tesla non-OHV. 2009 survey found 50% people in central valley want more OHV parks.	Noted	Carnegiejournal.com		11-Sep
6-53	Keep in State OHV inventory	Noted			11-Sep
6-54	Property does not belong to EBRPD, Bouth with OHV trust money, take off the map	Noted	Carnegie	Forever	11-Sep
6-55	Belong to Division of OHV Parks & Rec. to be an OHV park. Anything else is fraud and misappropriation	Noted			11-Sep
6-56	Don't try to ban OHV use at Telsa	Noted			11-Sep
6-57	Take Carnegie off the Master Plan	Noted	Curtis	Nagengast	19-Sep
6-58	Don't take Tesla from OHV community, we have nowhere else to go	Noted	Diana	Tweedy	19-Sep
6-59	Hands off Tesla, how about some OHV opportunity?	Noted	Patrick	Baird	19-Sep
6-60	Keep Carnegie out of the Master Plan	Noted	Curtis	Nagengast	19-Sep
6-61	Hands off. Just because the person behind this is rich and has political connections doesn't make it right.	Noted	Chuck	Oliver	19-Sep
6-62	Let the OHV parks keep and use their land which was bought with green sticker funds.	Noted	Motorcycle Club		19-Sep
6-63	Don't take Tesla	Noted	Ryan	Taylor	19-Sep
6-64	Turn over to OHV Division's mgmt. EBRPD direct resources to providing more mechanized recreation opportunities to better serve the public	Noted	Geoffrey	Beasley	19-Sep
6-65	Remove from M.P. and consider OHV use in current parks	Noted	Doug	Kennedy	19-Sep
6-66	Concerned there is a political agendat to take Tesla from OHV community, it was bought with OHV money	Noted	Greg	Kulosa	19-Sep
6-67	Leave for OHV, there needs to be more riding for youth	Noted	Don	Chamblee	19-Sep
6-68	Leave Tesla alone OHV park is required by law and does protect sensitive habitats and cultural artifacts on all OHV land	Noted	Carnegie	Forever	19-Sep
6-69	Stay away from Tesla. The OHV Division protects sensitive areas and cultural artifacts within OHV parks.	Noted	Diana	Tweedy	19-Sep
6-70	Take your hands off OHV parks, Tesla was purchased with OHV trust money.	Noted	Carnegie	Journal	19-Sep
6-71	Take off the M.P. Why is there no OHV activity in EBRPDs 112 thousan acres	Noted	Jerry	Fouts	22-Sep
6-72	Stay away from Tesla, need OHV opportunities in East Bay parks	Noted	Tyler	Zahn	22-Sep
6-73	Remove from M.P.	Noted	Diablo 4 Wheel		22-Sep
6-74	Delete from M.P.	Noted			19-Sep
6-75	Delete from M.P.	Noted			19-Sep
6-76	Leave Tesla alone and open to OHV	Noted			19-Sep
6-77	Remove from Master Plan, bought with OHV funds	Noted			19-Sep
6-78	Remove from M.P. No bikers, hikers or dogs.	Noted			19-Sep
6-79	Allow OHV uses that are already desinated OHV	Noted			19-Sep
6-80	Leave for OHV users	Noted			19-Sep
6-81	Take Tesla off Master Plan	Noted			19-Sep
6-82	Belongs to and was purchased by the OHV community	Noted			19-Sep
6-83	Needed to reduce overuse at Carnegie	Noted			19-Sep
6-84	Don't try to acquire Tesla, it wasn't purchased for that reason.	Noted			22-Sep
6-85	Keep your hands off my Tesla, bought with OHV funds	Noted			22-Sep
6-86	Stay of Tesla, use for OHV	Noted			22-Sep
6-87	Stay out, use for OHV	Noted			22-Sep
6-88	Don't grab Tesla from the owners, the OHV community	Noted			22-Sep
6-89	Remove from the M.P.	Noted			22-Sep
6-90	Bought with OHV funds, why does District ell it needs to be a stakeholder in this property	Noted			22-Sep
6-91	Why is P.E.E.R. and C.B.D. involved with EBRPD in decisions regarding OHV use at Tesla	Noted			22-Sep
6-92	Why is EBRPD including properties in the M.P. that are not for sale	Noted			22-Sep

Chapter 6 Related Comments: Key Challenges, Budget and Master Plan Map

No.	Comment	Map Revised/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
6-93	Remove from the Master Plan	Noted			22-Sep
6-94	Owned by OHV fund, how would EBRPD acquire it?	Noted			22-Sep
6-95	Should be a trails only OHV park to preserve the environmental and cultural resources	Noted			22-Sep
6-96	Stay out of Carnegie and Tesla	Noted			29-Sep
6-97	Keep Carnegie. OHV land Money was spent to purchase the extra acres. Keep it the way it was meant to be.	Noted	Cindy	Cooley	29-Sep
6-98	Stay out of Tesla and Carnegie	Noted			29-Sep
6-99	Opposed to any legal or illegal influence to prevent expansion of Carnegie near/on Tesla properties. Paid for by OHV community	Noted			29-Sep
6-100	Stay out of Carnegie and Tesla	Noted			29-Sep
6-101	State should keep for OHV use	Noted			29-Sep
6-102	Belongs to S.V.R.A. as it should	Noted			29-Sep
6-103	Purchased w/OHV funds w/explicit intent of expanding and improving Carnegie. EBRPD already has a lot of parks and land. Only 8 OHV State parks in the entire state. OHV is expanding quickly. Give us the space we deserve	Noted			3-Oct
6-104	Remove from M.P. Zero OHV trails in EBRPD	Noted	Jessica	Lewis	3-Oct
6-105	Remove from General Plan or possibly do a land swap with Calif. OHV parks.	Noted	Doug	McEtchin	3-Oct
6-106	Carnegie/Tesla should not be part of Master Plan	Noted			3-Oct
6-107	Keep Tesla off the M.P.	Noted			3-Oct
6-108	Based on proximity to Carnegie, it should include OHV use.	Noted			3-Oct
6-109	Tesla is a natural expansion of Carnegie and is needed because of impacted riding areas.	Noted			3-Oct
6-110	Take Tesla off Master Plan	Noted			3-Oct
6-111	District should not be involved in Tesla, paid for with Green Sticker	Noted			3-Oct
6-112	Should remain as State OHV property	Noted			3-Oct
6-113	Take Tesla off the Master Plan map and include OHV use	Noted			3-Oct
6-114	Remove from M.P. or landswap with State OHV	Noted			3-Oct
6-115	Is part of Carnegie. Should be kept for OHV use. Purchased with OHV trust funds	Noted			3-Oct
6-116	Leave Tesla to Carnegie	Noted			3-Oct
6-117	District should not pursue Tesla, or add OHV opportunities to future acquisitions.	Noted			3-Oct
6-118	Should not be part of M.P.	Noted			3-Oct
6-119	Should be left to the State for OHV use	Noted			3-Oct
6-120	ok for hiking and biking around Tesla w/additional land purchases, but Tesla paid for by OHV funds	Noted			3-Oct
6-121	Preserve and expand OHV land and activities at Tesla	Noted			3-Oct
6-122	Remove from M.P. keep as State OHV	Noted			3-Oct
6-123	Open to OHV. This is what our green sticker money has paid for	Noted			3-Oct
6-124	Purchased for OHV and should not be on MP	Noted			3-Oct
6-125	Open for OHV as originally planned. This is where green sticker money is going	Noted			3-Oct
6-126	Use for intended purpose, purchased by OHV funds	Noted			3-Oct
6-127	Shows how bad things have gotten. You're trying to steal Tesla and you are proud of it	Noted	Chuck	Oliver	9-Oct
6-128	Leave Tesla alone. Closest place to ride off road bikes, if you take it away we will be riding on your trails.	Noted	Diane	Oliver	9-Oct
6-129	Honor the State's purchase of Tesla with OHV fund monies, use it for its intended purpose	Noted			9-Oct
6-130	Remove from MP and allow the State to keep it for its intended purpose	Noted			9-Oct
6-131	Take off MP, Owned by Ca OHV Division, paid for by OHV trust, it is not up for grabs	Noted			9-Oct
6-132	Purchased with OHV money, remain part of Carnegie	Noted			9-Oct
6-133	Take off MP and keep for OHV	Noted			9-Oct
6-134	Take off MP paid for by OHV trust fund (3 People)	Noted			9-Oct
6-135	Remove from the MP	Noted	Sherry	Stortroen	29-Oct
6-136	OHMVR Division is currently holding public meetings as part of the general plan process for Carnegie SVRA, the inclusion of our SVRA in your Draft Master Plan is confusing and misleading to the general public	Noted	OHMVR Commission	Mr. Slavik	15-Oct
6-137	Request written confirmation of this clarification and your assurance that the Tesla parcel will be removed from any EBRPD acquisition planning map.	Noted	OHMVR Commission	Mr. Slavik	15-Oct

Chapter 6 Related Comments: Key Challenges, Budget and Master Plan Map

No.	Comment	Map Revised/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
6-138	Her grandfather once owned the property and it has Native American, historical and natural resources	Noted	Laurie	Gordon	11-Sep
6-139	Important that it remain in the M.P. Important transition zone for native plant habitat values	Noted			11-Sep
6-140	Keep in the M.P. as a Preserve	Noted			11-Sep
6-141	Keep on M.P. for cultural resource	Noted			11-Sep
6-142	Keep on the M.P. Map it has cultural, historical and natural resources	Noted			11-Sep
6-143	Preserve - Keep on the Master Plan and continue with the acquisition	Noted			11-Sep
6-144	Keep Tesla green, keep on the Master Plan, No OHV	Noted			11-Sep
6-145	Leave in the Master Plan as a potential preserve	Noted	Celeste	Garamendi	11-Sep
6-146	Leave it in the M.P. has sacred rock site, viewscales and petroglyphs	Noted	Marilyn	Russell	11-Sep
6-147	Should be a preserve	Noted			11-Sep
6-148	Support implementation as a regional preserve	Noted			11-Sep
6-149	Support inclusion of Telsa on M.P. for historic resources	Noted			11-Sep
6-150	Support it as a potential preserve	Noted			11-Sep
6-151	Tesla is priceless in terms of cultural, natural and historic features	Noted			11-Sep
6-152	Keep on Master Plan (cultural resources)	Noted			11-Sep
6-153	Should not be opened, should remain a preserve, not been approved for OHV	Noted			11-Sep
6-154	Keep on Master Plan, Keep OHV out, better designed for hiking, horses, bikes	Noted	Jane	Hart	19-Sep
6-155	I support keepint Tesla on the M.P. as a preserve	Noted	Irene	Jones	20-Sep
6-156	Keep Tesla in M.P., OHV riders don't comprise even 1% of total Alameda Co. population	Noted	Paul	Schaich	19-Sep
6-157	Support Tesla in M.P. as a preserve	Noted	Jennifer	Byous	11-Sep
6-158	Tesla matches objectives to preserve unique natural and cultural heritage sites	Noted	Les	Barclay	12-Sep
6-159	Adopt the M.P. with Tesla as a potential preserve exactly as presented in the draft	Noted	Dale & Carlotta	Schauer	14-Sep
6-160	To commend you for designating Tesla as a portential preserve in the M.P.	Noted	Wayne & Jacki	Shotts	13-Sep
6-161	Adopt the M.P. with Tesla as a potential preserve exactly as presented in the draft	Noted	Nancy	Rodrigue	13-Sep
6-162	Develop Tesla park for hiking and biking	Noted	Charles	Noland	19-Sep
6-163	Should be wilderness, prevent from use as OHV park, natural resources are a treasure and should be preserved at all costs	Noted	Garaventa	Consulting	19-Sep
6-164	Tesla would be a great non-OHV addition for quiet recreation and wildlife preservation	Noted	Arthur	Hull	19-Sep
6-165	Need Tesla to link the Diablo Crest (DCT - Diablo Crest Trail). Don't miss this opportunity.	Noted	Charles	Noland	19-Sep
6-166	Tesla is consistent with EBRPD vision, values and purpose. CEQA process will result in no OHV use on Tesla.	Noted	Celeste	Garamendi	22-Sep
6-167	EBRPD and State should cooperate for opening Tesla to hikers, birders, nature lovers, historic preservation, horses, bikers	Noted	Tri Valley	Trailblazers	22-Sep
6-168	Support the M.P. to designate Tesla as a regional park	Noted			22-Sep
6-169	CEQA not complete, not currently approved for OHV, appropriate to include in M.P.	Noted			19-Sep
6-170	Preserve this natural resource	Noted			19-Sep
6-171	Keep in the M.P. as a Preserve	Noted			19-Sep
6-172	Preserving Tesla in M.P.	Noted			19-Sep
6-173	Should be used for health care benefits and non-motorized use	Noted			19-Sep
6-174	Keep in Master Plan	Noted			19-Sep
6-175	Should be respected and protected as a culturally and spiritually significant Native American location	Noted			19-Sep
6-176	One of a kind combination of rare, historic, cultural and biologic resources	Noted			19-Sep
6-177	Should be maintained as an environmental, cultural, and historic resource	Noted			19-Sep
6-178	Make Tesla a regional wilderness	Noted			19-Sep
6-179	Include Tesla in M.P. as natural resource, promotes physical activity, preserves cultural and historic resources	Noted			19-Sep
6-180	Preserve pristine natural beauty, cultural and historical features. Perhaps venture between EBRPD and the State	Noted			22-Sep
6-181	Presve Tesla, keep on M.P.	Noted			22-Sep
6-182	Make a regional park	Noted			22-Sep
6-183	Opportunity for EBRPD to work with State and LARPD to preserve important and unique resources	Noted			22-Sep
6-184	Turn Tesla into a park for all to enjoy in its natural state	Noted			22-Sep
6-185	Has many natural, historical resources that need to be perserved, not destroyed by OHV use	Noted			22-Sep
6-186	The cultural and historical significance aligns with the mission of EBRPD	Noted			22-Sep

Chapter 6 Related Comments: Key Challenges, Budget and Master Plan Map

No.	Comment	Map Revised/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
6-187	Preserve the beauty and historic and natural resources	Noted			22-Sep
6-188	Support conversion to a regional park for everyone to enjoy	Noted			22-Sep
6-189	Tesla is pristine and should remain in the M.P.	Noted			22-Sep
6-190	Is historic and natural habitat for protect species	Noted			22-Sep
6-191	Matches District's vision, therefore it is appropriate for the M.P.	Noted			22-Sep
6-192	Work with State to protect and preserve	Noted			22-Sep
6-193	Do not let it be destroyed, save it for future generations	Noted			22-Sep
6-194	Appropriate for M.P. because matches District's mission and focus on preservation of important N&C resources	Noted			29-Sep
6-195	Appropriate for M.P. EIR process may result in no OHV use	Noted			29-Sep
6-196	Keep on the M.P. as an area of interest consider managing it as open space preserve like Del Valle	Noted	Janis	Kate	29-Sep
6-197	Manage Tesla as open space preserve	Noted			29-Sep
6-198	Keep Tesla on radar as area of preservation interest/open space	Noted			29-Sep
6-199	Expansion of Tesla land for OHV is not approved...keep on radar and EBRPD should comment on EIR	Noted			29-Sep
6-200	Keep on Master Plan as area of interest for open space preservation	Noted			29-Sep
6-201	Assist the State to manage Tesla as a preserve, as District does with Del Valle and Eastshore	Noted			29-Sep
6-202	Tesla as open space preserve managed by EBRPD	Noted			29-Sep
6-203	Support as preserve for K-12 and university level research because unique biological and cultural resources	Noted			29-Sep
6-204	Open for hiking but not off road. I like the proposed Master Plan	Noted	John	Liebenberg	3-Oct
6-205	Preserving Tesla is consonant with EBRPD vision. EBRPD should proactively comment on the Carnegie/Tesla EIR. EBRPDs fine record and established reputation would carry weight. Your vision is wonderful and should be shared broadly.	Noted	Laurie	Gordon	3-Oct
6-206	Keep Tri Valley Green. Keep Tesla in M.P.	Noted			3-Oct
6-207	Should be a green space that provides solitude, quiet, beauty and things that nurture human spirit	Noted			3-Oct
6-208	Consider managing Tesla like Del Valle and preserve it. No OHV use.	Noted			3-Oct
6-209	Preserving Tesla is consistent with the District's vision and mission. It is appropriate for EBRPD to comment on the EIR for Tesla.	Noted			3-Oct
6-210	Partner with State parks to preserve historic and cultural resources @ Tesla	Noted			3-Oct
6-211	Appreciate opportunity for trails at Tesla, advocate for Tesla to become a regional park	Noted			3-Oct
6-212	Has unique resources that EBRPD should be buying. Leave it as area of interest in M.P. Too important not to buy property there.	Noted			3-Oct
6-213	Stay with Mission: preserve open space. Keep Tesla as low impact, no OHV in M.P.	Noted			3-Oct
6-214	Keep Tesla in M.P. in natural form linking with other parks' trail systems	Noted			3-Oct
6-215	Too biologically important to allow OHV	Noted			3-Oct
6-216	Keep Tesla in M.P.	Noted			3-Oct
6-217	District should plan instructive role in the use of Tesla	Noted			3-Oct
6-218	Keep as a natural area. There is a lot of land available for other uses, such as hiking	Noted			3-Oct
6-219	has some rare native american features thousands of years old, as well as historic town site, keep as a cultural and historic resource (non-motorized) and for education	Noted			3-Oct
6-220	District should comment on Tesla EIR re Nat, Cult and Nat Am resources. Consistent w/District Vision. Make resources accessible to children, educators, researchers and hikers.	Noted			3-Oct
6-221	Is a high natural resource area, appropriate for park district	Noted			3-Oct
6-222	M.P. should protect Native American cultural resources in the Tesla area	Noted			3-Oct
6-223	Keep on M.p. State may fail CEQA for expansion plans	Noted			3-Oct
6-224	Keep in natural form for low impact enjoyment	Noted			3-Oct
6-225	Gorgeous area for horse use, would support local stables	Noted			3-Oct
6-226	Keep on MP, manage like Del Valle	Noted			3-Oct
6-227	K-12 can benefit from historical and cultural attributes so keep OHV out	Noted			3-Oct
6-228	EBRPD needs to spend money in the interest of the majority of users with focus on preservation of natural resources. Keep Tesla on MP	Noted			3-Oct
6-229	Should not become extension of OHV park. Keep in natural state	Noted			3-Oct
6-230	Keep motorcycle free	Noted			3-Oct

Chapter 6 Related Comments: Key Challenges, Budget and Master Plan Map

No.	Comment	Map Revised/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
6-231	Keep on MP map because of extraordinary natural and cultural resources and help the OHV community find a less sensitive area	Noted			9-Oct
6-232	Retain Tesla natural and human resources. Explore cooperation with State	Noted			9-Oct
6-233	Preserve and interpret important historic sites and interests at Tesla	Noted			9-Oct
6-234	Keep on MP	Noted			9-Oct
6-235	Do not expand Carnegie into Tesla	Noted			9-Oct
6-236	Should stay on MP as an area of interest and preserved as a resource	Noted			9-Oct
6-237	Keep on map, no OHV	Noted			9-Oct
6-238	Keep on MP. Save from same fate as Carnegie	Noted	Bob	Baltzar	8-Oct
6-239	Preserve Tesla	Noted	Todd	Bucher	22-Sep
6-240	Tesla directly matches the District's objectives to preserve unique natural and cultural heritage sites, preserve it	Noted	Karolyn & Gordon	Burkhart-Schultz	1-Oct
6-241	Entomologist, Tesla has many unusual and rare insects.	Noted	John	Doyen	15-Oct
6-242	Keep in MP	Noted	Archer	Futcher	30-Sep
6-243	Should not be utilized for a select few individuals who take pleasure in destroying habitat	Noted	J	Garaventa	3-Oct
6-244	Keep in MP	Noted	Jean	King	26-Sep
6-245	Include as a preserve, Native American historic/religious sites there and sensitive plant species	Noted	Jean	King	26-Sep
6-246	Eyesore to drive by or fly over Carnegie, please preserve Tesla	Noted	Tricia	Moore	9-Oct
6-247	Include Tesla in MP	Noted	Barbara	Phillips	10-Oct
6-248	Include Tesla in MP	Noted	Keith	Rothenberg	9-Oct
6-249	Keep in MP	Noted	Albert	Rothman	24-Sep
6-250	Include Tesla as a future regional park or preserve	Noted	Werner	Schlapfer	1-Oct
6-251	An historically rich asset and essential expanse of habitat	Noted	Jerry	Schweickert	12-Oct
6-252	Keep as a regional preserve	Noted	Barbara	Stear	29-Sep
6-253	Support Tesla in M.P. as a preserve	Noted	Cindy	Thomas	4-Oct
6-254	Keep Tesla in the MP	Noted	Donna	Whitmarsh	8-Oct
6-255	Keep in MP	Noted	Mary Ann	Hannon	21-Oct
6-256	Keep in MP	Noted	Barbara	Sokoloski	4-Oct
6-257	Keep in MP	Noted	Patricia	Wintch	2-Oct
6-258	Keep in MP, her father was W. Gatzmer Wagoner and owned Tesla for many years	Noted	Carolyn	Gordon	4-Oct
6-259	Keep in MP	Noted	Arthur	Hull	3-Oct
6-260	Fits the high priority issues in MP of Trails for all, Healthy Parks-Healthy People, Affirming the role and identity, Balancing funding priorities, Shift to green communities, Developing productive partnerships, Responding to changes in demographics, and Creating conservation and management standards for cultural and historic resources.	Noted	Richard and Doris	Ryon	18-Oct
6-261	Keep Tesla in the final 2012 MP as potential preserve and make no changes to that presented in the 2012 draft MP	Noted	Friends of Tesla		30-Oct
6-262	Maintain the position that the District stands ready to work with State Parks to manage the Tesla Park land as a non-OHV low impact historic and natural resource park and/or preserve.	Noted	Friends of Tesla		30-Oct
6-263	Continue to participate in the CEQA process for the Tesla Park land and submit comments when the DEIR is issued.	Noted	Friends of Tesla		30-Oct
6-264	Reject calls to not fully participate in the CEQA review, remove Tesla from the Master Plan and open EBRPD lands to OHV use.	Noted	Friends of Tesla		30-Oct
6-265	No public transit to Tesla. Consider removal from Master Plan, cost prohibited	Noted			19-Sep
6-266	Remove from M.P.	Noted			29-Sep
6-267	Remove from M.P. Encourage District acquisition of buffer zone properties around Tesla	Noted			29-Sep
6-268	Remove from the Master Plan	Noted			29-Sep
6-269	Take off MP, it was purchased with OHV funds	Noted			9-Oct
6-270	Take off MP	Noted			9-Oct
6-271	Take off MP	Noted			9-Oct
6-272	Off master plan	Noted			9-Oct
6-273	Take off MP, maintain as currently owned by State	Noted			9-Oct
6-274	How does EBRPD relate to Tesla	Noted			19-Sep
6-275	Friends of Tesla: make comments public	Noted			19-Sep

Chapter 6 Related Comments: Key Challenges, Budget and Master Plan Map

No.	Comment	Map Revised/Noted	F. Name	L. Name	Date
6-276	Opportunity for partnerships for biologic, cultural, education K-12 and university level research	Noted			19-Sep
6-277	Proposed policies for c.r. already happening at the SVRA next door and are in the State's Master Plan for Tesla	Noted			19-Sep
6-278	Integrate biking and hiking in Tesla into the Master Plan	Noted			19-Sep
6-279	Brings opportunity for public-private partnership and mitigation opportunities for Carnegie	Noted			22-Sep
6-280	Designate part of Tesla as community garden to educate children about native plants of the region	Noted			22-Sep
6-281	Consider acquiring Tesla	Noted			29-Sep
6-282	EBRPD considering any property bordering Tesla should provide buffer to avoid user conflicts	Noted			29-Sep
6-283	Inclusion to M.P. important. Tesla links other District parklands to create TriValley ridge trail	Noted			29-Sep
6-284	Neighbors that don't like OHVs are using EBRPD to steal the land. Was a mine then grazed, it is remote and would be little used by most East Bay people. Owned by Carnegie OHV. Neighbors hold elk hunds and are looking for more land to breed elk.	Noted	Keven	Moore	3-Oct
6-285	How does Tesla property fit into the Master Plan?	Noted			3-Oct
6-286	Does the District plan to maintain OHV use or convert the park to non OHV?	Noted			3-Oct
6-287	District should review and comment on EIR for Carnegie expansion into Tesla property	Noted			3-Oct
6-288	Whatever happens, continue OHV at Tesla. We would like to use the land responsibly.	Noted			3-Oct
6-289	Is a former mine with old mine tailings. It is not suitable for a hiking park.	Noted			3-Oct
6-290	EBRPD should purchase property adjacent to Tesla and Carnegie to create a buffer zone or mountain bike park	Noted			3-Oct
6-291	District should purchase property adjacent to Tesla as a buffer to prevent user conflicts, could be used as a mt. bike park	Noted			3-Oct
6-292	Is there an acquisition evaluation for Tesla?	Noted			3-Oct
6-293	Would like transparency in process regarding Tesla	Noted			3-Oct
6-294	There are unintended consequences of natural resource protection, sometimes means no one gets to enjoy it e.g. Tesla is isolated area people less likely to drive to for hikes when other closer opportunities. But dirt bikers will because no other options.	Noted			3-Oct
6-295	EBRPD should comment on cost of EIR for OHV use of Tesla	Noted			3-Oct
6-296	Wonderful link with East Alameda parks and Del Valle, etc	Noted			9-Oct
6-297	State parks does not want to release Tesla, waste of time focusing on it in MP process	Noted			9-Oct