

Topic (Number of Comments)	Requested Action, Element liked, or Concerns Raised
Accessibility (1)	ADA Parking - Expand to at least 2-3 spaces at top of hill (1)
Alternatives Preference (45)	<p>Prefer Alternative 1 (5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitates multi-day treks on Ridge Trail Access.</li> <li>• Addition of cabins.</li> <li>• Expansion of parking and ADA accommodations.</li> </ul> <p>Prefer Alternative 1 with specific alterations (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include no program-led campfires.</li> <li>• Additional parking.</li> <li>• Improved road access.</li> </ul> <p>Prefer Alternative 1 or 2 (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Like "walk-in" trail.</li> </ul> <p>Prefer Alternative 2 (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Smaller parking expansion.</li> </ul> <p>Prefer Alternative 3 (6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expands the trail system for hikers.</li> <li>• Preserves the space for habitat restoration and wildlife.</li> <li>• Focused on providing longer hiking trails and opportunities for birding and wildlife observation.</li> <li>• Least invasive on the ecosystems of the park.</li> <li>• Distracts the least from the beauty of nature.</li> <li>• Provides access to the most interesting areas.</li> <li>• No horse vendor and reduced equestrian parking.</li> </ul> <p>Prefer Alternative 3 with specific alterations (9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disallow campfires and camping.</li> <li>• No "Program-led" campfire area.</li> <li>• Mitigate the effects on wildlife including banning and enforcing off leash dog walking, fires, portable speakers, off trail excursions, and trespassing..</li> <li>• Minimal trail development in order to leave large sections of the preserve undisturbed.</li> <li>• Include summit seating <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Building to outlast fires will increase cost, which to me makes Alternative 3 the most attractive because it has the lowest cost. The extra features in the other alternatives can be added over time. It is important to just get started rather than wait for full funding for the most full-featured options.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Topic (Number of Comments)	Requested Action, Element liked, or Concerns Raised
<p>Alternatives – Specific Areas (20)</p>	<p>Jacobs Ranch area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose elements (3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Item E - showers and kitchen facilities.</li> <li>○ Item Z - equestrian vendor.</li> <li>○ Items L-O from Conceptual Plan Alternative Option 1.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Support Elements (4) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Items A-D and F-I from Conceptual Plan Alternative Option 1.</li> <li>○ Items X-Y and AD from Conceptual Plan Alternative Option 1.</li> <li>○ Items Q-W from Conceptual Plan Alternative Option 1.</li> <li>○ Item K from Conceptual Plan Alternative Option 1.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Sonoma Mountain Ranch</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oppose elements (2) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ item AA from Conceptual Plan Alternative Option 1.</li> <li>○ items J and AF from Conceptual Plan Alternative Option 1.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Support elements (2) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ J and AF from Conceptual Plan Alternative Option 1.</li> <li>○ Item AC from Conceptual Plan Alternative Option 1.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Summit Knoll (7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More natural of the two alternatives with just a rock wall circle showing what's in the view in that direction. (4)</li> <li>• At the very least, an elevation marker with a placard that indicates the summit. (1)</li> <li>• Combined to include both the compass rose, decomposed granite, and map bench detail. (1)</li> <li>• No trail through center, where rockpile is. Leave rockpile cairn in natural state, it's recent historic. Circle top with trail, and put benches in appropriate view places at outer edge of trail. (1)</li> </ul> <p>Whole Park (4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes to all!!!!!!!!!!!!!! (1)</li> <li>• Closely conform with the easements originally established by SCAPOSD when the properties were acquired by the county. (1)</li> <li>• No development from current state. (2)</li> </ul>
<p>Alternatives Scope (2)</p>	<p>Choices too narrow and not well explained</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was no room for alternative suggestions or not agreeing with any of the proposals. This is not a true attempt to get feedback from the public. It is more like well we've decided that A, B, or C is best and we don't care if you have any other ideas, proposals or objectives.</li> <li>• The proposed master plan draft is very difficult for the public to read and understand. It is challenging to understand what is new and what already exists. There is no explanation for any of the alternatives and their differences.</li> </ul>
<p>Budget (2)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forecasted construction and maintenance budget? (1)</li> <li>• Will design be completed by Parks' staff or consultants?(1)</li> </ul>
<p>Community Engagement (1)</p>	<p>Are you allowing scouting service projects yet? I know several scouts who would love to help out the parks! (1)</p>

Topic (Number of Comments)	Requested Action, Element liked, or Concerns Raised
Environmental Review Scope (6)	<p>Alternatives analysis and the CEQA analysis should include and analyze :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unequivocally, there are potentially significant environmental impacts associated with the park’s project alternatives.</li> <li>• Requires a robust and substantiated CEQA analysis by qualified professionals as to whether the project can meet a defined need for mitigation(s).</li> <li>• The development of additional structures, spaces intended to accommodate more people, children, dogs, cars, trucks, trailers, trash, water demands, etc. will indefinitely lead to noise pollution and environmental pollution.</li> <li>• Modeling of the risk and impact of Firebrands along with the mountain winds and fuel loads . . . [more information provided] . . . NSMRP has several groves of Redwoods mixed in the ladder fuels of Oak, Bay, and chaparral of which fire spread must be understood and mitigated.</li> <li>• Third-party, impartial wildlife impact study (done by someone other than Fish &amp; Wildlife) to determine the potential effects of this proposal.</li> <li>• Existing hazardous conditions that should be reflected in the environmental setting (baseline) of the CEQA document. This includes a data-based analysis of habitat, topography, climate, fire history, fuel types, density, anticipated fire behavior, and threats to adjoining properties and the region . . . assessment of wildfire hazard potential and fire protection plan that conforms to the National Fire Protection Association Standards [and] PRC § 4290, the Fire Safe Regulations.</li> <li>• Proposed expansion plan with addl. campsites, cabins, parking lots, food/picnic areas, etc. would absolutely have negative environmental and wildlife impacts. . . . Campsites are notorious for leftover trash, including food remnants. Much of our local wildlife cannot consume these things, as it could lead to serious reactions/death. [Further explanation and references provided.]</li> <li>• Expansion/development proposed, including additional parking lots, possible construction of additional cabins, play areas, open spaces will further encroach on our local wildlife's habitat and their right to roam.</li> </ul>

Topic (Number of Comments)	Requested Action, Element liked, or Concerns Raised
Facilities (23)	<p>Specific comments and suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ranger Host Entrance: We are opposed to the location of this structure on proposed plans 1 and 2 which would create additional noise from vehicles and from conversations.</li> <li>• Gathering area for educational programs will be an asset.</li> <li>• If the house and barn are being made available to the Parks, I'd prefer a natural history educational center there or something like it. Or a residence for a park ranger.</li> <li>• Low, wildlife-friendly lighting.</li> <li>• Install inaccessible trash boxes to prevent wildlife from scavenging.</li> <li>• In the built &amp; accessible area of Jacobs, add a simple circle about 20 feet across using gravel for ceremony. Maybe some boulders in the four directions.</li> <li>• Play areas for kids and group camping/cabin experience possibilities because they facilitate introductions to nature for kids and adults with little previous experience in nature. (2)</li> <li>• I don't understand why children would need a recreation area — when i was growing up on Sonoma Mountain, the trees and rocks and trails were my playground. (1)</li> <li>• Less (or the same amount) car parking. (1)</li> <li>• Have a restroom at any parking area or meeting/camping area in the park. (2)</li> <li>• Limit restrooms strongly to maintain Preserve, Adding showers and flush toilets to the park will only make the water table drop created by the proliferation of residences and vineyards in Bennet Valley worse. (1)</li> <li>• Provide water. (1)</li> <li>• Hiking trails, parking lots, benches, picnic tables, signage, and some accessibility accommodations are all understandable improvements that will allow people to enjoy the land safely while keeping human impact to a minimum. . . . Bunk houses, playgrounds, cabins, group campsites, showers, meeting spaces, kitchens, barbeques, horse rentals... all of this sounds very invasive and disruptive. (1)</li> </ul>
Master Plan Approach (5)	<p>Commenters requested that the Master Plan approach:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conform to the Conservation Easement. (1)</li> <li>• Include fire prevention &amp; mitigation. (1)</li> <li>• Provide responsible budget and maintenance plans. (1)</li> <li>• Prioritize the well-being of mountain lions. (2)</li> </ul>
Natural Resources (17)	<p>Management Suggestions (15) include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rotational grazing.</li> <li>• Fuels management.</li> <li>• Limiting the building and trail footprint.</li> <li>• Getting a baseline survey.</li> <li>• Buffers for sensitive resources.</li> </ul> <p>Prioritize mountain lions and protect wildlife corridor (2) by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No nighttime activities.</li> <li>• Strictly limiting human activities.</li> </ul>

Topic (Number of Comments)	Requested Action, Element liked, or Concerns Raised
Neighbor Impacts (10)	<p>Camping and other park improvements effects on neighbors (6):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Noise - loss of quiet and serenity.</li> <li>• Vandalism.</li> <li>• Trespassing.</li> <li>• Loss of privacy.</li> <li>• Additional traffic exacerbating problems with emergency evacuation.</li> <li>• Increased risk of wildfire.</li> </ul> <p>Address boundary maintenance and trespassing (3):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extensive signage.</li> <li>• Prepare private property owners with a plan.</li> <li>• Numbers to call during an incident.</li> </ul> <p>Neighbor meeting request (1)</p>
Public Process (15)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Arbitrary - County should know the danger to public safety and property caused by lighting campfires in the tinderbox of Sonoma County. (1)</li> <li>• CEQA - Are the Alternatives a CEQA document or when will CEQA occur? (1)</li> <li>• Commitments - Agreement to plant vegetation as a visual barrier. Sadly, this has never materialized. (1)</li> <li>• Digital Access - Fix security warnings and other digital access issues. (3)</li> <li>• Feedback process - Take Facebook comments. (2)</li> <li>• Information availability.</li> <li>• Provide publicly available SCRP SOP for fire management (1)</li> <li>• Request add to mailing list. (4)</li> <li>• Maps <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Utilize an overlay map/diagram system that clearly shows how each proposal built on what was provided on the previous one and what was added. (1)</li> <li>○ Storybook is interesting on desktop, but is not workable on mobile. (1)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Timing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Stick to the timeline. (1)</li> <li>○ Extend public comment. (1)</li> <li>○ Delay comment until after the pandemic to allow in person, town hall style meeting (1)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Written Description – Presentation and maps not clear: request written alternatives discussion and master plan. (4)</li> </ul>

Topic (Number of Comments)	Requested Action, Element liked, or Concerns Raised
Recreational Uses – Overnight Stays	<p>Overnight Stays of All Kinds (18)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prohibit (18) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ noise at night.</li> <li>○ potential effects on wildlife.</li> <li>○ prevent commercial-seeming uses.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Bunkhouses (6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prohibit (5) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ insufficient access for safety and maintenance. (3)</li> <li>○ Bennett Valley Plan prohibits commercial development. (1)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Support (1) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ OK with stays led and organized by Parks' staff.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Camping (87)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow (22) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ location near developed areas.</li> <li>○ on the ridge trail.</li> <li>○ such a beautiful place. (22)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Limit (19) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ only on Jacobs Ranch.</li> <li>○ without fires.</li> <li>○ overseen by docents or Parks' staff.</li> <li>○ only outside fire season.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Oppose (40) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ adverse impacts on wildlife and habitat connectivity.</li> <li>○ increased nighttime noise.</li> <li>○ logistical maintenance difficulties.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Camping &amp; campfires (86)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support (2): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ but no campfires,</li> <li>○ if the evidence supports that it is not likely to start fires.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Oppose (84) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ associated fire risks.</li> <li>○ if fires are not allowed, campers will light them anyway to cook.</li> <li>○ adequate patrols to keep people from being unsafe with fire would not be possible.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Recreational Uses - Activities	<p>Day-use Horses Prohibit (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trails are narrow with switchbacks and the riders of day-use horses are often inexperienced.</li> </ul> <p>Disc Golf – Include. (3)</p> <p>Fire Prohibit (60):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All potential sparks eliminated - no campfires, BBQs, smoking, etc.</li> <li>• Ban other potential ignition sources such as glass bottles in sunlight and target shooting.</li> </ul> <p>Limit (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Acceptable to have lanterns and stoves powered by gas, jellied petroleum, and pressurized liquid.</li> </ul> <p>Fires: Campfires Prohibit (19):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sonoma Mountain is steep and has not burned for a long time.</li> <li>• Prohibit camp stoves and BBQ pits.</li> <li>• Neighbors would not be able to evacuate during a wildfire because their neighborhoods have constricted access.</li> </ul> <p>Geocaching (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geocaching challenge in the parks that when completed would be awarded a trackable coin. (1)</li> </ul> <p>Group Events (10)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit (8) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ small events only.</li> <li>○ no commercial events, organized events such as marathons, private events such as weddings.</li> <li>○ no alcoholic beverages.</li> <li>○ no amplified sound.</li> <li>○ support ranger and naturalist hikes and school field trips.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• No group trips to the Summit. (1)</li> <li>• Include group picnic area. (1)</li> <li>• Support. (1)</li> <li>• Nature/hiking groups.</li> <li>• Educational and community groups.</li> </ul> <p>Harvesting (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow mushroom foraging for personal use!</li> </ul> <p>Natural Play Area (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Natural materials only; no play structure.</li> </ul> <p>Whole Park Approach to Recreational Uses (10)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit development as much as possible to preserve habitat connectivity and wild open space. (9)</li> <li>• Expand. (1)</li> </ul>
-----------------------------------	--

Topic (Number of Comments)	Requested Action, Element liked, or Concerns Raised
Recreational Uses- User Groups	<p>Cyclists (38)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow Mountain Bikes (9) because Mountain will provide good rides.</li> <li>• Limits on Mountain Bikes (11) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ only certain trails.</li> <li>○ separating individual uses (hiking, cycling, and horseback riding).</li> <li>○ separating low-speed and high speed uses.</li> <li>○ Make trails one way.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Prohibit Mountain Bikes (17) because <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ potential trail and environmental damage.</li> <li>○ unsafe interactions with other trail users.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Dogs (82):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow (54) – fun, increased safety, good family outings. Not enough dog trails in Sonoma County.</li> <li>• Allow only on some trails. (9)</li> <li>• Allow dogs on leash to BART overlook. (1)</li> <li>• Prohibit in the Preserve entirely (18) Limit or prohibit because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Adverse effect on wildlife and natural resources.</li> <li>○ Adverse interactions between dogs and cyclists, equestrians, and non-dog hikers.</li> <li>○ Not able to share the trail with dogs because of allergies or adverse, unavoidable social interactions.</li> <li>○ Almost no places to walk without dogs in Sonoma County.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Electric Bikes (7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prohibit.</li> </ul> <p>Equestrians (10)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit (5) to certain trails – potentially make one long loop trail for horses and the remainder no access.</li> <li>• No summit access. (1)</li> <li>• No equestrian parking - reroute to Jack London State Historic Park and let equestrians come in from that side. (2)</li> <li>• Prohibit. (1)</li> <li>• Question (1) –best route for horse trailers from Petaluma.</li> </ul> <p>Multiple Users (20)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support Multi-Use Trails. (6)</li> <li>• Horses and bicycles only in dry conditions. (1)</li> <li>• Want separated –use trails (5) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Emphasize Hiking; more hiking only trails. (4)</li> <li>○ Equitable Division. (1)</li> <li>○ Mountain Bikes separated and less. (2)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Everyone do what the park needs and follow the rules. (1)</li> </ul>
Signage (13)	<p>Suggested Signs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• boundaries markers. (1)</li> <li>• Natural Resources interpretive signs (4) habitat importance and protection.</li> <li>• Rules interpretive signs (2) trail easements and dogs.</li> </ul>
Staffing (2)	<p>Want:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regular, permanent staff with authority.</li> <li>• More rangers, sightline from ranger residence to campground.</li> </ul>



Trails	<p>Accessibility (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Want rental mobility aid. (1)</li> </ul> <p>Coopers Grove (9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interpretative trail sharing the rare experience, well-designed to prevent damage to the trees. (2)</li> <li>• Limit access to hikes led by rangers or docents only. (4)</li> <li>• Prohibit access. (2)</li> <li>• Want trail there. (1)</li> </ul> <p>Trail Design (15)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desired traits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ trails that reduce footprint.</li> <li>○ loop trails.</li> <li>○ a trail to the summit.</li> <li>○ gentler slopes.</li> <li>○ good views.</li> <li>○ some mix of up and down.</li> <li>○ avoid sensitive areas.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Limit the amount of trails to protect habitat connectivity and wildlife, especially on top of mountain. (8)</li> <li>• Stay out of the edge of forest area to preserve wildlife connectivity across the summit.(1)</li> <li>• More wild and scenic, less engineered trails. (1)</li> <li>• Except for the Summit, no new trails to undisturbed areas. (2)</li> <li>• Support more trails, most plans for expansion seem valid. (1)</li> </ul> <p>Entry Trail (4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• could create a problem with people parking on the narrow road. (1)</li> <li>• creates safer park entry for cyclists. (1)</li> <li>• rerouted to avoid potential midden sites and archeological resources. (1)</li> <li>• oppose. (1)</li> </ul> <p>Equestrian Parking to Campground</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unneeded (1) Equestrians will stay with rig.</li> </ul> <p>Jacobs Ranch Area (5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support trails in the area (4) - short trails near the trailhead and the Entrance Trail for hiker/cyclist safety.</li> <li>• Limit trails (1) in order to protect mature oak woodland and steep slopes. The Meadow Loop trail crosses wetlands.</li> </ul> <p>Sonoma Mountain Ranch Area (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support! (1)</li> <li>• Connect to Jack London via fire road/access road to the south NOT on knoll at the top of Jack London. (1)</li> </ul> <p>Summit Trails (4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support. (3)</li> <li>• Connect Jack London Access Trail and Mountain Loop Trail. (1)</li> </ul> <p>Umbrella Tree Trail (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support making it a loop trail.</li> </ul>
--------	--

Topic (Number of Comments)	Requested Action, Element liked, or Concerns Raised
Trails (cont.)	<p>Trails Whole Park (11)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support expanding. (3)</li> <li>• Fewest possible and high-quality trails possible to prioritize hikers and single-track trails. (1)</li> <li>• Limit to protect resources. (7)</li> </ul> <p>Trailheads (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An additional trailhead, additional entrance road and parking area, would be a benefit to the community as the park is expanded. An off road parking and trailhead facility about 1/3 mile west off Cooper's Grove on the hilltop has potential, if that land is indeed owned by the County.</li> </ul> <p>Maintenance to Address (2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Curves in the switchbacks getting very slippery after rain and hikers.</li> <li>• Cyclilsts forming use trails and creating erosion by going off designated trails.</li> </ul>
Transportation (44)	<p>Access (22) Park entry road and surrounding roads are narrow, leading to insufficient room for large vehicles and traffic constriction during special events or community evacuation. Requested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand Road.</li> <li>• Prohibit large vehicles.</li> <li>• Limit development to fit.</li> </ul> <p>Entry Gate (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Move closer to Sonoma Mountain Road.</li> </ul> <p>Equestrian Parking (7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support plan to move further from main parking. (1)</li> <li>• Prohibit at NSM and move to JLSHP. (7)</li> </ul> <p>Evacuation (1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Driveway from Sonoma Mtn Rd to the trail head is inadequate and inadequately maintained for emergency at current park capacity. It will be worse with expanded use.</li> </ul> <p>Shuttle between JLSHP and Sonoma Mountain. (3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Run at least once a day for hikers. (1)</li> <li>• Repave road before increasing trips. (1)</li> <li>• Prohibit. (1)</li> </ul> <p>Parking (9)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No expansion. (1)</li> <li>• Concerned about capacity and people parking along Sonoma Mountain Road; request strong signage and enforcement. (3)</li> <li>• How many spaces are planned? (1)</li> <li>• Has there been a traffic study? (1)</li> <li>• Limit. (3)</li> </ul>