

DRY CREEK GREENWAY

Public Forum #1

June 2 and June 7, 2003

PUBLIC QUESTIONS, COMMENTS AND CONCERNS

Enforcement of regulations was an issue raised in both sessions. Concern was expressed that if we develop the Greenway, we need to be able to enforce and maintain it. Also, one attendee indicated that the City (of Rocklin?) does not enforce conditions on the subdivision behind the Rocklin Park Hotel.

Public Access through private property was generally unwelcome.

Preserving habitat without infringing on private property rights was deemed an important challenge. A question was also raised about how habitat can be protected while increasing public access. An attendee asked whether the Greenway would permit access to the water for swimming and fishing.

A question was asked whether during our information review we found **consistency between policies** of different jurisdictions. One resident suggested that the Greenway plan could help to create consistency between the policies of different jurisdictions.

A concern was expressed that **low flow crossings aren't always well maintained** and can cause a barrier to salmon migration. The crossing downstream of Vista Oaks was referenced in particular. General concern was expressed about impacts of development to the salmon run.

Four wheel drive and motorcycle use was indicated as a problem in at least one area. One resident asked that if dirt bikes are prohibited from accessing the Greenway, where are they allowed to ride?

Native American sites were noted in the watershed, and concern was expressed that they be preserved. One site in particular was identified on Miners Ravine between Sierra College Blvd and Barton Road. It was noted to have burial plots and grinding rocks.

It was noted that salmon were identified in Miners Ravine in 2001.

The effect of higher peak flows and quicker returns to low flow on **salmon** due to increasing urbanization was seen as an important issue.

A question was asked regarding current **requirements for on-site detention** on new development.

There was a general concern about the **negative impacts of development along the creek**, particularly flooding and erosion.

One resident expressed concern about **inconsistent setbacks on Clover Creek**. They mentioned that the regulations specified an average minimum distance, rather than an absolute minimum.

There was a question about how the PPT members were selected.

An attendee asked how **acquisitions of property along the creek** would occur?

The question was raised about how the Greenway plan would affect **fire danger**.

Residents of **Hidden Valley** were concerned that their node be for local (homeowner) access only.

A comment was voiced that we should consider the **1975 update to the General Plan** that attempted to regulate creek property in the Loomis Basin.

One resident expressed concern about **pesticides** and other toxics in the creeks.

A **sensitive area** was noted on Secret Ravine just upstream from its confluence with Miners Ravine. Goals for this area should be to limit off-road vehicle traffic, decrease sedimentation, and increase habitat value.

One resident was concerned that the node at Cook-Riolo Road indicated that a trail would be located in his backyard. He later sent an email indicating that the land across from his parcel (on the other side of the creek) was publicly owned by the County.

The node at Miners Ravine and Sierra College Blvd should have trail and parking access.

High quality wetlands and woodlands were identified in upper Clover Valley Creek. Some of the best undisturbed land in the watershed was noted on lower Dry Creek. A private spot for viewing and hiking was noted on Miners Ravine.

Traynor Preserve on Sierra College Blvd north of King Road should be added to our Parks and Open Space map.

A realignment of the Class I bike trail connecting Miners Ravine to FLSRA along Douglas Blvd is being considered. The new alignment follows Strap Ravine.

Concern was expressed about public intrusion in the Secret Ravine Greenway corridor between Sierra College Blvd and King Road (currently identified as habitat with potential recreation use).

The suggestion was made that were trails can't be located along the creek, they should be placed along rural roads with separation between the road and the trail.

The question was raised about the compatibilities of the trail uses in a multi-use trail system.