

**Santa Rosa Citywide Creek Master Plan
Technical Advisory Committee
Meeting # 5**

Tuesday, July 25, 2006

10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Santa Rosa Public Works Department
69 Stony Circle, Santa Rosa, CA 95401
MSC-South, Conference Room 5

Attendees:

Meeting attendees included:

Susan Gorin, Santa Rosa Planning Commission
Martin Clinton, Santa Rosa Cycling Club
Steve Brady, Santa Rosa Public Works
Wally Lowry, Santa Rosa Waterways Advisory Committee
Alistair Bleifuss, Santa Rosa Public Works
Eleanor Guerin, Sonoma County Trails Council
Carol Vellutini, Sierra Club
Kate Symonds, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Kenneth Tam, Sonoma County Regional Parks
Ken MacNab, Santa Rosa Advanced Planning and Public Policy
Fabian Favila, Santa Rosa Transit and Parking
Jason Nutt, Santa Rosa Public Works
Marta Puente, Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District
Colleen Ferguson, Santa Rosa Public Works
Becky Frank, Caltrans Office of Transit and Community Planning
Ron Benkert, Sonoma County Water Agency
Steve Weinberger, W-Trans
Randy Anderson Land People
Denise Cadman Santa Rosa Utilities
Christine Culver, Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition
Lisa Grant, Santa Rosa Recreation and Parks
Dan Schurman, Laguna de Santa Rosa Foundation

Notes:

1. Attendees were welcomed and introduced themselves.
2. Sheri Emerson presented a status report and reviewed revised work plan.
 - a. Draft Natural Resources Report online. Excel spreadsheet on restoration recommendations.
 - b. Do plans and concepts reflect current plans?
 - c. 11 goals for Master Plan, including protecting property rights.
3. Randy Anderson explained preliminary draft Recreation, Access and Transportation Component products and the procedure to submit comments:
 - a. Priorities for Review
 - Alarming statements, map info shown, or missing, that must be addressed before this goes to the public

**Santa Rosa Citywide Creek Master Plan
Technical Advisory Committee
Meeting # 5**

Tuesday, July 25, 2006

- System-wide concepts and standards, format and extent of maps and descriptions
 - Site-specific conditions and proposals
 - b. Existing conditions documented
 - c. Typical improvement concepts described in Section 2.0 of report
 - d. Detailed maps and descriptions contained in Section 3.0 of report, for breakout or solo review
 - Are existing conditions shown accurately?
 - Are planned improvements appropriate?
 - Are paved and unpaved trail locations appropriate?
 - How well does the illustrated trail system function?
 - Showing, describing and tabulating supporting features:
 - Street/creek trail crossings/undercrossings – special situations/needs
 - Entry points – where park and open space opportunities – need more details, are they in Parks MP?
 - Existing and proposed parking – who owns, how much available, do they want us to show?
 - Existing and proposed trail bridges (do we have/need more info about them?)
 - Existing restrooms (none proposed) – OK to show?
 - Interpretive opportunities
4. Review of maps at watershed stations (individual comments):
- a. Lisa Grant, Santa Rosa Parks: Concerned about park/open space opportunities shown. Contact Marc Richardson, Director.
 - Subdivision-based pocket parks can create public confusion about potential acreage.
 - Maintenance is an issue.
 - Parks priority is programmable space: gyms, etc.
 - Neighbors could take conceptual parks on as neighborhood organization – vote for maintenance district?
 - If not in City General Plan, label as “potential” or “conceptual.” OK if not in City limits.
 - b. Becky Frank, Caltrans Office of Transit and Community Planning – comments on legend:
 - What’s an FDP?
 - Use a different symbol for Class II bike lanes (triangles?).
 - Put railroad is in Master Legend?
 - Clarify and call out project limits in Master Legend.
 - Identify significant land use generators and destinations for bike and pedestrian trips.
 - c. Carol Vellutini: Tactile strips valuable at crossing and entry points.
 - d. Steve Brady. Roseland Creek path may need to be shown on side away from school. Steve is working on this for Concept Plan to be incorporated into Master Plan.
 - e. Martin Clinton: p. 3-4 of EIR project description needs to include Transportation.
 - f. Becky Frank. Issues with 101 crossings, could speak with Sonoma County Transportation Authority, they control the funding of projects.

**Santa Rosa Citywide Creek Master Plan
Technical Advisory Committee
Meeting # 5**

Tuesday, July 25, 2006

- g. Christine Culver. Need to show proposed trail treatments as well as existing conditions on all maps.
 - h. Steve Brady. Pathway placement not accurate on map tiles, sometimes covering structures, etc.
 - i. Susan Gorin. Good to include policy language for fencing of creek when a development straddles a creek. Minimum distance before fencing, don't want to block wildlife movement through the corridor. Setback amounts. Development not allowed to straddle a creek?
 - j. Lisa Grant. Need to treat/label 'blue sky' pocket parks as potential ideas, not as planned. Parks Dept does not have capabilities to develop or maintain. Before public meeting need to label parks, trailheads, open space appropriately.
 - k. Martin Clinton. Lornadell Creek could be a bicycle connection to Bennett Valley if a trail was possible along or within the right of way.
 - l. Kate Symonds. Delta Pond area, take care with trails planning due to heron rookery. Connection of this system to Laguna trails will bring more people to wildlife areas, be sensitive in planning. Least amount of trails needed to protect wildlife. North south route needed, connection to SMART is a good one.
 - m. Ken MacNab. Montgomery Drive project at Waterways on Thurs. Access along Santa Rosa Creek an ongoing issue. SMART comments available online, responding to comments on EIR. Access, biological issues.
5. Summary comments after map mark-up:
- a. Ron Benkert. Road classifications need to be clarified and corrected: existing, missing, bad conditions.
 - b. Becky Frank. Maps are organized. Address legend items, map format, consider land use destinations and generators for bike and pedestrian traffic.
 - c. Colleen Ferguson. Good group of people working on project, lots of materials.
 - d. Fabian Favila. Many more creeks in Santa Rosa than thought. EIR Project Description needs to mention City bike and ped plan. Chapter 3, Section 3.2 – integrate plan with City's Bike and Pedestrian Master Plan.
 - e. Ken MacNab. Level of information is amazing. Most interested in policy discussion to follow later. Good to put information on GIS map system and make available to City planners for use.
 - f. Ken Tam. Lots of information, will review more. Will provide information on County projects.
 - g. Kate Symonds. Judicious choice of where to put paths, need to be sensitive to wildlife. Some creeks should be left along and preserved. (Randy: please provide list of top 5 creeks for this).
 - h. Carol Vellutini. Will study maps more, aerials are very useful. Tactile strips at trail entries should be included in standards.
 - i. Eleanor. Good to see partnerships between agencies, organizations.
 - j. Alistair Bleifuss. Lots of information, need your help to sort it out. Updates will be coming, keep checking the web page. Missing a tile on Santa Rosa Creek set.
 - k. Dan Schurmann. Laguna Foundation would like to bring people out to Laguna – trail connections. Looking for identified restoration opportunities. Didn't see the restoration projects (Sheri: they were behind the trails maps. Randy: please provide top 10 areas you would like to see restored).
 - l. Steve Brady. Locations are off on some trails, through existing structures, for example. Also, pathway through golf course could be a safety issue for trail users.

**Santa Rosa Citywide Creek Master Plan
Technical Advisory Committee
Meeting # 5**

Tuesday, July 25, 2006

- m. Martin Clinton. Lots of good ideas on connections, paths. Important that proposed connections are captured.
- n. Susan Gorin. Important to include information about bike connections. Burbank Avenue EIR will be certified on Thursday, as development projects follow good to have communication on this plan between City departments, developers. Be proactive on creek planning. For a later draft, schedule study session with Planning Commission, also educate planners on the process, plan. As area plans are developed, keep communication open.
- o. Sheri Emerson. Thanks to all who participated today. Takes more than one, two, or ten people to develop a plan, it is an entire community that is needed. Appreciate the TAC's help and energy, will make the Plan the best it can be.
- p. Denise Cadman. Natural resources are important, invasive and sensitive species are an issue in these creeks. Need to designate areas as preserves. This is a good educational piece as well, indicating that some of the landscapes can and should be protected for nature.
- q. Christine Culver. Paved vs. unpaved areas, need to identify. Also need to explicitly show Class 1 bike lanes on the maps, existing and future.
- r. Susan Gorin. Walked with a neighborhood group recently along Rincon Valley Creeks. Need to think about which closed roads can be opened, which gates to replace with what types of barriers, such as bollards.
- s. Ken MacNab. Recognize concurrent signage projects, important to coordinate efforts.

All comments from the maps and comment sheets will be considered in preparing the public draft.

6. Review of next steps:

- a. Thursday, July 27 – Waterways Advisory Committee
- b. Tuesday, August 1 – deadline for comments to be reflected in public draft
- c. Tuesday, August 8 – post updated public draft set on City website
- d. Wednesday, August 16 – Public Workshop

The meeting ended at approximately 12:10 p.m.

Prepared by Randy Anderson and Sheri Emerson.