Task Force Members Present:
Alicia Borowski; Frank Croft; Bill Konle; Michael Patterson; Kathy Rairden; Doug Reynaud; Carla Ruigh; Brian Seifert; Richard Von Bargen; Jan Webb

PUBLIC COMMENT

Two members of the public spoke regarding their opposition to development of a golf course as part of the master plan.

Ellen Foley informed the Task Force of a new book available with more information on the Martin Murphy family entitled California-The Irish Dream

Jim Woodward expressed his concern that paragliding/hang gliding has not been included in Phase One.

REVIEW COMMUNITY AND PRC MEETINGS

Notes from the Community Meeting were reviewed and highlights from the presentation to the PRC of the program document were discussed. The PRC accepted the program document, but requested additional information on the regional context of the park. The PRC showed a strong interest in the master plan, and will receive full Task Force agenda packets, and will be encouraged to attend Task Force meetings.

REVIEW CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING THE ALTERNATIVES

The various criteria were presented for reviewing the alternatives: master plan goals, natural resource management goals, environmental and financial. Rough matrices were presented for the financial and environmental evaluations. Task Force members had the following comments.

- Financial: in addition to knowing % recovery of user fees, it would be helpful to know number of users.
- Environmental: it may be helpful to have more categories than just “plus” and “minus”, perhaps varying levels of significance similar to an initial study.

REVIEW CONCEPT ALTERNATIVES

Three concept alternatives were presented and discussed, with the following comments:

- Clarification is needed as to what is meant by “street adjacent trails” and how these would impact neighborhoods.
- Consider street adjacent trails along Roop Road
- How will fencing work?
- Accessible trails should be clearly identified.
- OK to not show “wilderness” or “remote” camping in the alternatives.
- There was general consensus that only one alternative (alternative 3) should show a golf course and that alternative 2 should show more passive park features that could serve a growing rural community. Vasona Park was mentioned as an example, although it was generally agreed that the park should have more of a rural character than Vasona.
- Show both 18 and 27 hole golf course scenarios in alternative 3.
- Consider enlargements of the western flat area to better illustrate the concepts.
- Consider leaving a portion of the western flat area as undeveloped with the idea that decisions could be made in the future as needs dictate.
• The County should consider acquiring land elsewhere specifically for a golf course.
• It is important to consider regional needs, not just the needs of the adjacent community as this is a County park for all County residents.
• Show a paragliding/hang gliding landing site in Alternative 3

General consensus for alternatives in the western flat area:
Alternative 1: Very passive with agricultural preservation as the theme.
Alternative 2: Some development with a rural park theme
Alternative 3: Golf course theme.

Task Force members were encouraged to further review the alternatives and send comments to Lee for inclusion prior to the next meeting.

It was also noted that more detailed trails planning will occur during development of the preferred alternative phase.

Upcoming Meetings:

Next Task Force Meeting: Changed from January 31 to Feb. 7, 2002