

Notes

Dry Creek Greenway Public Forum #1 Granite Bay Library, June 7, 2003 10:00am-12:00pm

Kate Kirsh, Foothill Associates' project manager for the Dry Creek Greenway Master Plan, started the meeting by introducing the team and briefing the Greenway boundary. She identified one of the primary challenges as the need to preserve the creek character as development occurs. She explained the challenges inherent in multi-jurisdictional planning.

A question was asked about how the Public Planning Team (PPT) was selected. Kate answered that the Oversight Team members identified interested and active parties in their jurisdictions.

Kate briefed the philosophy of willing participation. One of the key tenets of the Greenway is to work with interested and willing private property owners, and to find alternative solutions if owners are unwilling to apply Greenway goals to their parcels.

An attendee asked for a definition on unauthorized access, which Kate had mentioned when presenting the slide showing damage to a site along the creek by trail bikes. Kate explained that by "unauthorized access," we mean access to private land where trails are not designated.

A resident asked who was on the PPT. Kate said that we could send him the list if he provided his name and address, or he could check the website at <http://www.foothill.com/greenway/meetings.htm>.

A question was asked how we protect habitat while increasing public access. Kate explained the concepts of stewardship and enforcement. Stewardship for the Greenway will create pressure by the community on misbehaving individuals. Additionally, it becomes easier to enforce rules if locations are established where controlled access is permitted. The concern among several of the attendees was not so much with access by local residents, as with outside access from places such as Sacramento.

Kate was questioned whether the plan included all creeks in the watershed. She said that it included the major creeks, and explained the habitat vs. recreation focus. One resident questioned how acquisitions would occur. Kate responded that we're currently in the process of evaluating and prioritizing properties, and that not all properties within the Greenway would be identified as desirable for acquisition. Furthermore, acquisition would be from willing sellers only, and that several options were available, including the use of conservation easements and fee title purchase. Chris Schmidt elaborated that the County does not expect to put trails on all of the creeks, that acquisitions are often tied to development, and that the County will be negotiating with willing sellers to acquire access rights. One of the attendees commented that many of the properties along the

proposed Greenway are already in public ownership, and they thought the issue was one of public management rather than acquisition.

Kate presented the photo tour of the Greenway.

One resident asked how the Greenway would affect fire danger. Kate responded that increased usage should not appreciably increase fire danger, and that improved trails will also provide improved accessibility for emergency vehicles.

Kate was asked if we considered the attempted 1975 General Plan update that attempted to regulate properties along the creek in the Loomis Basin. She indicated that we had only considered current general and specific plans, since those were the currently applicable regulations. A resident suggested that we might learn something from the earlier failed attempt.

The group broke up into the working sessions to comment on the maps. A brief summary of some of the comments follows:

- *Do bicycles share trails with equestrians?* Trails are multi-use, intended to be shared by bicycles, pedestrians and equestrians, and that there are established “rules of the road” on who yields to whom.
- *Does that County have designated equestrian trails and are other uses prohibited?* Kate answered that the County does have trails designated as equestrian, but non-equestrian users are not prohibited.
- The bike path connecting Miners Ravine to FLSRA may follow Strap Ravine to Douglas Blvd. This alignment is currently under consideration.
- *Do not implement the Greenway unless the jurisdictions are able to maintain and manage it.*
- *What water access will be permitted or prohibited and how do you maintain habitat if you don't prohibit bathing, wading, etc (and enforce noncompliance)?*
- Concern was expressed about having strangers having access to private resident's backyard, and the potential impacts of trail users to riparian vegetation.
- Large setbacks along Auburn-Folsom road should allow separation of bikeways from the road.
- Bikes pedestrians and equestrians are compatible with each other if signage, appropriate trail widths, trail shoulders are properly designed and used.
- *How will access to the Greenway be provided?* Nodes are access points. They will have a hierarchy from neighborhood nodes with no parking to regional access points with parking and facilities.
- *How are traffic impacts on local roads projected?* Traffic engineers will be part of specific designs at the County Planning level.
- *How will maintenance and upkeep be performed?* The plan will address options. Patrol and enforcement are major issues. Maintenance is probably not as significant, since the types of facilities being planned are typically low maintenance.

- The Trainer preserve at Humphrey and English Cottage Way was pointed out as a good example of a multi-use space.
- *Where does the money for implementation come from?* Chris Schmidt with Placer County Planning mentioned several sources, including Placer Legacy, Park fees, and private developers.

The meeting concluded with Kate signing out photo packs and thanking the participants.