Time and Location:
October 23, 2008, 6:30 pm- 8:30 pm
Gunderson High School Cafeteria
622 Gaundabert Lane
San José, CA 95136

Attendance:
There were 140 attendees at the second public workshop. Attendees included Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation Department (County Parks) staff, members of the consultant team, members of the Task Force and TAC, a representative of the Donor and 128 community members.

Meeting Summary:
The County Parks Department held the second Community Workshop for the development of the Martial Cottle Park Master Plan on October 23, 2008 at Gunderson High School. The intent of this workshop was to receive community feedback on the three Draft Alternatives. The workshop is summarized below according to the following agenda items:

- Welcome and Introductions
- Project Background and Alternatives Overview
- Breakout Activities
- Summary of Breakout Activities
- Next Steps
- Closing Remarks

A. Welcome and Introductions

Patrick Miller, Principal of 2M Associates and subconsultant to the lead consultant, DC&E, initiated the workshop by welcoming workshop participants and introducing Lisa Killough, County Parks Director.

Lisa Killough thanked participants for returning for the second community workshop and for participating in the Martial Cottle Park Master Plan process. She has seen a lot of excitement in the process; thank you to the public (who are going to use the park) for keeping the enthusiasm alive. Killough highlighted the following:

- Martial Cottle Park is an unusual park which has been made possible through the donation of one special person, Walter Lester, who is a neighbor to many of the workshop participants and currently lives on site. Mr. Lester, whose family has owned the property since 1860’s,
donated the property to County and State Parks in 2003. We all owe gratitude to him for his extreme generosity.

- We are almost halfway through the planning process. Tonight is a great opportunity for everyone to put their imprint on the park’s design. Everyone will definitely have a chance to give input tonight.

- Acknowledgement is due to people who have been involved in the process, including Task Force members have been at table since conception of the plan. Supervisor Don Gage has been very supportive of the park, along with the Board of Supervisors. Dave and Frank Giordano represent Mr. Lester in the planning process, making sure we conform to Donor’s vision. In house Project Team members were also acknowledged, including County Parks and State Parks staff and the Technical Advisory Committee which is comprised of local, state, federal agency staff, agricultural advisors, and non-profit representatives.

- DC&E is the new prime consultant for the project. SAGE and 2M Associates, two of DC&E’s sub consultants, were represented at the workshop.

Prior to turning the presentation over to DC&E, Patrick Miller asked for a show of hands for people who live more than a mile from the park. From the show of hands, it can be assumed that most participants live within close proximity of the park. This is supported by the map shown below upon which participants were asked to locate their residence. When Miller asked how many people had attended the first workshop, there was a much greater show of hands.

Workshop participants located their residence on the above map using colored dots. Nearly all dots are shown in this image.
A. Project Background and Overview of Draft Master Plan Alternatives

Sarah Sutton, Principal in Charge for DC&E, the prime consultant, provided an overview of the project schedule and management structure. She emphasized that there are many people who are involved in the planning process, including workshop participants, the Technical Advisory Committee and the Task Force. The workshop is part of Phase 4, Design Development.

Isabelle Minn, Project Manager for DC&E, provided an overview of the project, existing conditions and the three draft alternatives. She discussed the individual character of each alternative as well as the commonalities between all alternatives.

B. Breakout Activities

Patrick Miller introduced breakout activities by emphasizing that not one alternative would be the end-all be-all and encouraged participants to discuss the balance between recreation and agriculture. The three activities conducted in each breakout group are described below:

Activity 1: Multiple Choice Questions. Participants were instructed to complete the front side of the form and provide any additional feedback on the back.

Activity 2: Priority dot exercise. Each participant was given a blue dot to attach to the alternative that best fit their vision and a green dot to attach to the alternative that almost met their vision.

Activity 3: Alternative Review/Comments. Participants were encouraged to write comments on the alternatives at their breakout station. Miller emphasized that the more information given about likes/dislikes/ideas, the better and that the project team really wanted to hear from everybody. 125 people will think more comprehensively than five.

Each participant was assigned a table number. Each of the six tables had one or two facilitators, who were either members of the design team, County Parks staff or Task Force members. The activities were completed by each group over the course of an hour. During this time, Patrick Miller circulated throughout the room in order to observe each group and answer questions.

C. Summary of Activities

Miller provided a summary of his observations as he circulated between tables. In general, blue and green dots were pretty evenly spread out across the three alternatives. (The final dot count completed after the meeting indicated that Alternative A received 59 blue dots and 31 green dots, Alternative B received 31 blue dots and 42 green dots, and Alternative C received 27 blue dots and 41 green dots).

Many groups wanted to know when the plan would be implemented. Miller provided an answer to this question based on direction from Lisa Killough. The Master Plan and environmental review work will be done about a year from now; then County Parks and State Parks have opportunity to make something happen. The Park opening could be as soon as 2012. As far as funding and management, the donation agreement that was reached with Mr. Lester basically resulted in the County and State sharing acquisition. It is understood that County will take the lead and be responsible for ongoing operations and management with the State providing oversight. Economic limitations of the project are not so much on capital improvements but the cost of operations and management.
Facilitators from each table then summarized new things they had learned and highlights from the breakout discussions. These highlights are listed below.

Table 1
- Want community involvement in implementation
- Security concerns
- Want lots of organic vegetables
- Generally don’t like Snell entrance
- Identified vineyard potential
- Felt more parking is needed in some plans
- Park could be used as emergency area for disasters
- Wondered why equestrian uses- there are no horses
- Questioned whether there is enough water for farming.

Table 2
- Concerned about horse-trailers and buses accessing site
- Preference for access location spread across alternatives
- Interest in agriculture serving as buffer between road and perimeter trail
- Felt café was not historic and did not fit in with park, but interest in cooking classes and potentially a concessionaire stand for large events
- Important to maintain views of Westside residents to hills- preference for shorter trees.

Table 3
- Everybody wanted dots right away and had done their homework;
- From traffic standpoint- Snell and Branham intersection was not as liked
- Interest and excitement about wildlife, including beneficial insects
- People wanted as much access as possible
- A lot of concern about separation of bikes and pedestrians- people don’t want to be run over
- Interested in having horses actually wander around like pedestrians.

Table 4
- Really liked Plan B for the most part due in part to access on Branham- more visible and people invited in; liked having activities centered near Branham and felt there was a better future connection to Life Estate
- People really like historic part of park
- Interested in education/sustainability opportunities
- Want more community garden space
- Nighttime access on both sides- really wanted to walk at night/ really didn’t want people in at night.
- Interested in using old farm equipment

Table 5
- Safety in the park
- Many people wanted more trails
- Interest in more access points
- Interest in farming and people helping out with community gardens
- Preference for alternative split between A and C

Table 6
- Adequate buffers a concern
• Protecting views of residents
• Concern about youth agricultural programs and how would we partner
• Concern about who would run farming operations
• Great interest in farmers market
• Dots were scattered across alternatives
• Support for equestrian uses and trails
• Question: Where are the restrooms for trail users?
• Question: When would the park be accessible? (As PM mentioned- targeting 2012).

D. Next Steps

Miller provided an overview of the next steps.

• October 31, 2008: California State Park & Recreation Commission Hearing for Martial Cottle Park Naming & Classification
• November, 2008: Development of Draft Preferred Alternative. During this time phasing, the Williamson Act and funding will be looked at in more detail.
• December 10, 2008: Task Force Meeting #5, Draft Preferred Alternative.
• January, 2009: Workshop #3, Draft Preferred Alternative

Participants were invited to mail/fax/email Jane Mark additional comments in timely fashion.

E. Closing Remarks

Jane Mark thanked everyone for participating and sharing their ideas. She acknowledged and thanked the following people and groups:

• Frank Giordano, the Donor’s Representative who has been very involved and helpful.
• Task Force members: Kevin O’Day, Deputy Agricultural Commissioner; Laura Moncyznski, Bruce Medlin of Colony Green; Charlie Fredericks and Adina Pierce of VEP; Rob Iverson of Gunderson High School, and Greg West, Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation Commission
• TAC members: Hans Toensfeldt of Santa Clara County 4-H and Clover Foundation; Mike Kent, UC Cooperative Extension Master Gardeners
• Project Team: Don Rocha, Kimberly Brosseau, Rachel Santos of the Santa Clara County Open Space Authority (provided funding for project), and Debbie Cedillo, responsible for setting up the refreshments
• California State Parks: Eddie Guaracha, Sector Superintendent, Gavilan Sector of Monterey District

Patrick Miller thanked the members of the public, and stated that all comments, including dots, will be summarized.

Attachments

• Attachment 1 is a list of workshop attendees.
• Attachment 2 provides a summary of the forms completed during Activity 1.
• Attachment 3 provides a summary of Activities 2 and 3, including images of the graphic alternatives upon which each table recorded their comments and placed their dots as well as a summery of comments received.
### Members of the Public

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Organization Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abdo</td>
<td>Christine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abel</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alkire</td>
<td>Alissa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>Vida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arias</td>
<td>Larry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asfiha</td>
<td>Mehertab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avanzino</td>
<td>Marylou</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaumont</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behringer</td>
<td>Lu Anne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boesch</td>
<td>Larry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boesch</td>
<td>Keiko</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boroughf</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boroughf</td>
<td>Tami</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bousman</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>VEP Community Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bousman</td>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>VEP Community Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boverio</td>
<td>Bill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brocato</td>
<td>Dominic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brocato</td>
<td>Karen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle</td>
<td>T.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centanni</td>
<td>Nick</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chav</td>
<td>Jon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chen</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Harold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dalrymple</td>
<td>Albert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danoff</td>
<td>Adrienna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decker</td>
<td>Katherine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubrava</td>
<td>Ellit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubrava</td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durst</td>
<td>William J.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>Carrie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engelhardt</td>
<td>Elise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferguson</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferm</td>
<td>Kim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabel</td>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabel</td>
<td>Edward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallardo</td>
<td>Juan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galopp</td>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glickman</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunyin</td>
<td>Marie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td>Kathi</td>
<td>Girl Scouts #811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen</td>
<td>Bailey</td>
<td>Girl Scouts #811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heyne</td>
<td>John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holt</td>
<td>Lynda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horii</td>
<td>Ronald</td>
<td>Friends of Santa Teresa Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosford</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosford Bob</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes Michael</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson Bill</td>
<td></td>
<td>VEP Community Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnston Dan</td>
<td></td>
<td>UC Cooperative Extension Master Gardeners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khan Nasser</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kienka Daniel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kistler Frank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kossow Susan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krebs Ryan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristiansen Terge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamers Larry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lance Lorraine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larson Jerry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Jason</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linke Ralph</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luzod Tom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester Becky</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mannos Christine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Michael</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martell Dave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathewson Kathryn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGuirk Sue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mehertrab Asfihn</td>
<td></td>
<td>NAQCPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milatin Milouan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monahan Kitty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monczynski David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Doreen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mueller Mike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngo Mabel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen Rick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nguyen L.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuzawa Nick</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson Scot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olson Marc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owens Linda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patterson Leeann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedweault Ken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perez Jess</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perez Joe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perez Joy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pieriaszek Ron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prichard Tamara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramamoorthi -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rastler Dan</td>
<td></td>
<td>VEP Community Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rastler Ronda</td>
<td></td>
<td>VEP Community Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recotta Edward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reed Jacqui</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reyes Jose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruble Jim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruble Lucy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruel George</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russo Conrad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Russo Vincenzina
Ryan ?
Scanlin Randy
Shoberg Bob
Shoberg ?
Smith Sandi
Smith Kent
Smith Vicki
Smithe Philip
Souza Manuel
Stephens Beth
Stevens Duane
Tiede Bracey UC Cooperative Extension Master Gardeners
Tucker Mae
Turk Joe
Valencia Jesus
Valencia Irma
West Greg
Wong Harv
Wong Elaine
Wong Leland
Zaffonato Dennis
Zaffonato Terry
Zepeda Rosalinde
Zepeda Maria
Zepeda -

Task Force Members
Giordano Frank Donor's representative
Friedericks Charlie Member-at-Large
Monczynski Laura Hayes Neighborhood Association
O'Day Kevin Santa Clara County Deputy Agricultural Commissioner (also TAC)
Pierce Adina VEP Community Association
West Greg Santa Clara County Parks & Recreation Commission
Iverson Rob Member-at-Large
Medlin Bruce Colony Green Homeowners Association

Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)
Giordano Dave Donor's Representative
Toensfeldt Hans Santa Clara County 4-H /Clover Foundation

Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation Department
Killough Lisa Director
Mark Jane Project Manager
Brosseau Kimberly Park Planner
Cedillo Debbie Office Specialist
Rocha Don Natural Resource Management Program Supervisor
Luogo Ryan Park Ranger

CA State Parks
Guaracha Eddie Sector Superintendent, Gavilan Sector of Monterey District
Santa Clara County Open Space Authority
Santos Rachel Planner II

Consultants
Sutton Sarah DC&E Principal in Charge
Minn Isabelle DC&E Project Manager
Swick Isby DC&E
Miller Patrick 2M Associates
Kraus Sibella SAGE
Responses to Activity 1: Questions and General Comments

**Total number of Comment Forms received** = 113

**Question 1 – Which vehicular entrance best serves the function of the Park and impacts neighborhoods the least:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Park Entrance</th>
<th>Tallies</th>
<th>Sub-totals</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chynoweth Avenue</td>
<td>1111111111111111111111111111</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snell Avenue</td>
<td>111111111111111111111111111111</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branham Lane</td>
<td>111111111111111111111111111111</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chynoweth Avenue**
- A less traveled road
- Event impact shopping at all with the Branham entrance
- Snell entrance too busy a street
- Branham and Snell have very heavy traffic now. Any other entrance will make this worse.
- Less busy street than Snell or Branham which is more congested
- Too much traffic is on Snell and Branham – Chynoweth would be much better
- Less traffic issues, perhaps no need for signal light intersection.
- Snell already has a lot of traffic. Branham entrance would further complicate the commercial traffic at the corner shopping center.
- On the Branham Lane entrance has had a lot of accidents (casualties), whereas the Chynoweth Avenue would be better for all.
- (1) Reduced traffic of the other two major roads, (2) more control / access of entrance
- Chynoweth has space. Snell and Branham are too busy. Branham is crazy and busy with Safeway and McDonald’s!
- Snell and Branham are very busy streets and putting an entrance on them would cause more congestion.

---

1 Results include four additional sets of comments received after the 10/23/08 Community Workshop
2 There were public comment forms that did not identify a preference for the park’s vehicular entrance.
As this is a child attractive park, it is safer to have an off-the-main road entrance. Being a State and County park will attract people not familiar with the area so safer for them to go in and come out of a side street. i.e. they won’t come to a dead stop in the middle of two heavily traveled roads (Snell and Branham).

Off the main road. Snell and Branham can get busy, dangerous for cars to merge and people to cross.

It’s off the main road and it’s closest to my house. Needs farmers market.

Corner of Snell and Branham is already busy with retail, access to Capitol Expressway or Monterey Road. Too busy to add another street feature near here. Chynoweth Avenue, however, will be a dead-end, with a light at Chynoweth & Snell, only park guests or residents will be targeting this entrance.

Minimize parking impact (off-site) on neighborhood.

Less impact on traffic

This may allow non-park traffic on Braham and Snell to continue flowing.

Less traffic on Chynoweth Avenue. Branham (even after widening) is a major thoroughway to Monterey Highway.

Snell and Branham are too busy. Park entry and egress will impede traffic flow. Chynoweth is wide and quiet.

Less busy, wide streets.

It’s the least busy road access.

There is enough commute traffic on Snell and Branham – a park entrance on these two streets would only make it more congested for locals living in the area.

Although Branham has a light and entrance is planned opposite Safeway entry, I find that intersection already causes traffic backups. I use Branham as a major through street even if not going shopping. It would be too congested with entry off of it even if widened. The idea of parking overflow at Safeway isn’t smart because parking lot is inadequate as is on weekends and evenings.

Branham too busy. Snell better. Chynoweth entrance places park in quieter area.

Wherever entrance – may need a light. Branham already has too much traffic with shopping center. Snell has too much traffic.

Branham & Snell very busy now and that would impact greatly.

Chynoweth – if traffic is low (low impact to neighborhood). A Snell entrance would be bad for flow of non-park traffic.

Chynoweth is already wide enough – no thru traffic; already has a stop light; is secluded so only people wanting to go to the park will be there; has a good VTA entrance.

Least traffic impact; less loss of crop land

Quiet street, will not block traffic when going in

If Branham, use existing light by bank.

It is not a road that serves as a main route. It is primarily a community road.

Chynoweth is a wide street with little traffic and it dead end. This would mean most traffic would be just the park.

Visitors to park may not jeopardize regular traffic on Snell or Blossom Hill Road or Branham.

The shared intersection (traffic light) with the Safeway shopping center would probably be far too congested...unless perhaps Branham was widened.

Less traffic on the street, other two streets are busy.

Least “other” local traffic. Minimal “traffic light” impact

Fewer cars on Chynoweth, no thru traffic

Wide street

Fewer people live in that area

Chynoweth could handle the traffic and there is already a traffic light.
• There is already a light on Chynoweth. Any other entrance requires a new light.
• Less traffic access both directions. There should be road signs to the entrance since this entrance is somewhat remote.
• Snell and Branham roads have too much traffic already. Residents would like more pedestrian access points.
• Proximity to light rail
• Off main road
• Easier – less traffic
• Less general traffic on this road(!!?)
• People living in the neighborhood north of Branham will have an even harder time turning left towards Safeway because of the increased traffic. Having the entrance on Snell will also make available parking in the Safeway parking lot even more scarce.
• No accidents
• Branham Lane and Snell Ave. are busy and difficult for commuters.
• Snell has traffic that shoots through at 30-45 mph. Putting a traffic light between Chynoweth and Branham on Snell would be very unpopular with residences. East/ west with intersection of Snell and Chynoweth because there’s already a big string of lights on Snell from Blossom Hill to Chynoweth. Pedestrian crossing of Snell between Chynoweth and Branham is very dangerous without controls. Only viable alternative is Alt. C, an area currently underused and has better access to Light rail station/ Blossom Hill Station. I think widening Branham to accommodate a main entrance there (Alt. B) would be a mistake aesthetically from a traffic strategy. Branham is a big alternative for traffic heading north and west during the morning commute hours as the other choice takes you into Capitol Expressway which is already at maximum capacity.
• Branham Shopping Center traffic is a concern here and jaywalking.
• Open space. Could easily place a traffic signal. Easy to walk to via Vista Park. Since homes nearby, easy to drive slowly (i.e. jaywalking). Easy to find via Blossom Hill Road/85 highway.

**Snell Avenue**

• Snell has traffic flow from 85 via Blossom Hill and 87 via Capitol Expressway
• Snell is already a thoroughfare for traffic
• Snell is the major street with most traffic. Placing the entrance here will have the least impact on surrounding neighborhoods.
• Most easily accessible and visible for passerby…Branham is too busy. I think it would impact traffic negatively if the entrance were there [Branham].
• It is off a main thoroughfare and not through residential area. Concern for traffic and air pollution.
• Snell has better flow of traffic. Does not increase traffic on Chynoweth. Don’t want parking to become overbearing on Chynoweth. Branham, there are already a traffic problem.
• Because Snell is the street most people will come to the park from anyway. Chynoweth doesn’t flow through and must be entered from Snell.
• Off an already busy street
• Thought the access on Snell might give central access, only thing is Snell is busy already and may need road upgrades. Thought Branham entrance was congested with Safeway. Chynoweth is a good alternative but may need input with residents on that street.
• An entrance off Snell would be dedicated and not competing with shopping center or neighbors off Chynoweth. It would draw people into heart of Park. Activities would be spread out and not competing with each other.
• There is already frontage on Snell Road to provide easier access to Park. Also, traffic would not have to be on a more residential type street.
• Snell easier to get to from CA 85. Branham too much traffic. Chynoweth dead-end stub.
Like Plan A best but have entrance on Branham lane at stop light.
Least neighborhood impact; street is wide; balances traffic flow; away from Safeway entrance; need traffic light.
Traffic already on Snell. No Branham traffic – too busy now.
By choosing Snell, local neighborhoods would not be detrimentally affected. Snell can be widened to accommodate a main entrance.
I want people to see the Park, that’s why I am okay with either Snell or Branham as the car entrance. I definitely like the idea on many entrances for pedestrians.
I want the park to be visible to the neighborhood, the demonstration garden to be seen from Branham Lane.
I also want that open space
Like the idea of native nursery plants
Community garden

Branham Lane
This is a mostly commercial area with easy access to the main streets (Snell, Branham). The entrance and backed-up traffic into the park will flow normally on Branham Ln. The shopping center parking lot can also act as overflow for any large functions that are occurring at the park. This entrance has the least impact on residential areas.
Branham Lane already has Safeway shopping centre and won’t create new traffic.
Branham already has a lot going on and an entrance across from the shopping center would be great when driving.
Option B provides access to all visitors.
Branham is not completely overused and there is long stretches between Snell and Vistapark which would accommodate traffic. Snell Avenue is crowded and also has a lot of traffic/accidents.
There is a stop light at the Branham location. The Branham Lane location is part of Plan B, my first choice. This location provides easiest access to the park for traffic on Branham or Snell, the two busiest streets near the park. Also, least disruption for those who live on or near Chynoweth.
However, I think Chynoweth is better. Less time would be used to enter the park as opposed to the Chynoweth Avenue entrance. [Note: Responder chose Branham as best serving the function of the Park.]
For recreational use as well as community gardens.
Impacts home owners the least, existing light onto site
Convenient and easy to access for the public.
I live in Colony Green. Many homeowners park on Chynoweth Avenue. It is fairly quiet street. If the entrance is on Chynoweth, the entire park on the south, north and east would be busy streets.
It’s wide enough to sustain the traffic flow.
Widened road with light could handle traffic – with light. Traffic is too fast though, Chynoweth would be better for that.
The light off Branham to the shopping center can be used for the park. Chynoweth impacts neighborhood.
Chynoweth – although wide, is too close to homes. Snell – too busy. I’m sure the plan would include a light controlled intersection but that wouldn’t change my opinion. Branham is best if Branham were widened, which it needs anyway.
There is already a light there. Also, farmers market, fruit stand/entrance would be convenient near Safeway.
Visibility of the park facilities to passing vehicular traffic to help let people know that this is here. Respect for Chynoweth-side residents (I am not one, but I understand their concern).
• Branham is already commercially impacted – less likely to affect surrounding housing, where parking is already crazy. Snell is a problem; too much traffic, high speed drivers. Chynoweth is probably safer, but housing will be negatively impacted.
• Already widening Branham Lane and already have business entrances. Chynoweth is worst plan – these people will have traffic and parking issues. Also, keep the rural parts of the park towards the neighborhood.
• Branham has wider roads to accommodate more traffic – potential back-up. Minimum 4 lanes.
• Most visible to bring people into the park.
• Stop light already in place.
• Since the entrance is across from the Safeway parking lot it would impact the neighborhood least.
• Invites people in due to visibility; wouldn’t impact neighborhoods.
• Because there are other commercial establishments on Branham
• Access and egress are on mainly on Branham, though some access is on Snell. Those entrances do not affect residential.
• Branham is best because Chynoweth bad idea. Too close to Farmers Market – a conflict.
• Across the street from Safeway Parking lot. The shopping center will bring more people into the Park.
• Only if Branham is widened to 2 lanes each direction – otherwise Snell is top pick
• Keeps traffic away from neighborhoods
• Consistent with Plan B, which we prefer
• Does not impact Chynoweth residential area
• There is an existing signal
• Cars are not driving through much of the Park (Plan A draws cars more than half way through Park). Keep car movements to a minimum – cars are detractors
• Stop light is in place
• Shopping center for refreshments
• Most accessible and convenient
• I live on Chynoweth (across from main entrance – alternative C) and I feel that the traffic would not impact us as long as parking would be allowed along Chynoweth like Almaden Lake Park.
• I don’t think we will know the impacts until it is in effect. It would be nice to have two entrances that could serve as main entrances depending on future unknown impacts.
• This entrance to the park should have minimal neighborhood impact since it will be opposite an already established commercial area, Snell and Branham Plaza. In addition, this option will take advantage of the widened Branham Lane which should absorb any additional traffic that will increase due to the park. The other two options will add traffic to either Snell Avenue or Chynoweth Avenue severely impacting the neighborhoods.
• Branham Lane and Snell Avenue seem too busy to support a park entrance. Street traffic would be negatively impacted by park traffic. If the Branham Lane expansion could add a park entrance lane and use the same light as the Safeway entrance, it may work. This could eliminate the street parking concerns in the neighborhoods, but I have no idea what it would do to the Safeway parking. It looks like it would be a significant design effort to make it work.
**Question 2: Should the Park include other ancillary recreational uses (like a dog park, equestrian uses) in addition to agricultural areas and programs?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
<th>Sub-totals</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1111111111111111</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1111111111111111</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Comments for Yes/No Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dog park only</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog park-yes, horses-no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely, a dog park and extensive walking trails (on-leash) for people and dogs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of course!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but no horses! Dogs-yes!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but no horses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most definitely a dog park and bike trail on the outside perimeter of the park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes to dog park, no to equestrians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All areas need farmers market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there is enough space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not necessarily horses, but it might alleviate people from using private property for their dogs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but NO animal functions! (Excrement?! Yuck! Extra city costs for cleanup. No!)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, for reflecting ponds, statuaries, historical landmarks / discovery / museum, botanical gardens (native CA plants). Similar to Overfelt Park would be nice…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Park!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but no equestrian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, but no equestrian. Not many horses in area and space can be put to better use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog park O.K. Not wild about equestrian trails – those and auto roads impede foot traffic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog park!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community center / farmers market / expanded picnic areas / tree-lined walking areas. No equestrian area! Serves few people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, dog park would be great. Equestrian on trails is good, but facilities too large on Alternative B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes! Equestrian!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

There were public comment forms that did not respond to this question.
| | Must have dog park  
|---|---
| | Yes, but no equestrian activities  
| | The pond/lake is a good idea. Farmers market.  
| | 4-H  
| | Dog park only – not equestrian  
| | Other uses okay – no dog park  
| | Dog park for recreational walking  
| | Farmer’s market  
| | Dog park only  
| | Dog park  
| | Horses okay, no dog park, only dogs on leashes allowed  
| | Farm animals. Absolutely horses  
| | Dog park  
| | It is important to have working agriculture areas: farmer’s market, demonstration gardens, agriculture research areas, youth areas for 4-H and other “ag.” groups. I don’t think we need a dog park in an agriculture area, instead put farm animals in that area.  

| No | Don’t want dog and horse dropping in park. Even with best of intentions, humans don’t clean up after animals and do not adhere to rules such as no pets off-leash.  
|---|---
| | Unless dogs are only allowed in dog park. I’ve been to many parks in communities which allow dogs to run free, or at least don’t/can’t enforce people cleaning up after them, resulting in smelly parks.  
| | No dog park – not in donor’s vision, serves a very local need and detracts from the park’s purpose. No equestrian boarding – farm horse demos perfect but for owner use. No dangerous and not donor’s vision. Also both dog poop and horse hoofs hurt the soil.  
| | I do not know the kind gentleman who donated the land – his vision sounds more education/agriculture/history focused.  
| | Keep the park natural, most like its current state. Most use for people rather than dogs and horses. Also, do what’s best for wildlife already using this area.  
| | Dog and horse trails are not indicative of local agriculture and will take away the quiet enjoyment of the pedestrian trail.  
| | Equestrian uses serve only a few people.  
| | Can add later if high demand  
| | No dog park  
| | I’m not big on a lot of horses in the area.  
| | There are other Dog Parks in the area and I don’t think anyone would bring a horse if they can’t leave it overnight.  
| | No dogs! If allow dog park, keep far away from people’s areas and gardens  
| | It should be a simple plan  
| | As per the meeting, there are many alternatives around. This Park, as I understood was to be agricultural only. “Historical Agricultural Park” by donor. Dog runs and horse areas are not agricultural to me.  

| Neither | Doesn’t matter or undecided |
**General Comments**

- I like park idea 3 [Alternative C], but add a dog park and more pedestrian entrances
- Keep the lake, café or drink stand
- Have trails in all plans
- Would like to see more orchards which 50 years ago this valley was covered with. Also want the water feature as large as possible for migratory birds. Last year there were over 50 egrets – would love to see them back.
- We would prefer as many walking trails as possible
- Have parking inside by various areas
- As many pedestrian entrances as possible
- There needs to be pedestrian access points on each street bordering the park (Snell, Branham, Chynoweth, Blossom Hill). Because this will be an agricultural “relaxing” type of park most visitors will be walking in from surrounding areas. I feel a pond will be more beneficial than an equestrian center since most residents in area do not own horses.
- There should be some type of perimeter bike trail, similar to Los Gatos Creek Trail and Coyote Creek Trail.
- I do not care for Plan C. The best is plan A and plan B would be second choice.
- Most important (in following order): dog park, walking trails, ponds, farmers market, picnic area, grassy area, youth agriculture
- The more pedestrian access areas, the better
- More miles of walking trails
- Biking trails should be considered as well
- Definitely a big picnic/BBQ area
- Public restrooms
- Pond is a must; fishing would be great, too
- Horses for hire
- Pond is a must, fishing is a plus
- Lots of walking trails; bike accessible would be great as well
- Picnic area should be vast, and a good restroom when you have some gas
- Ponies and horses for rental use, long as we agree not to abuse
- Roadways and parking need to be large enough for 40 feet school buses coming in for field trips. Get input from transportation departments of school districts, Oak Grove School District, San Jose Unified School District, etc.
- I would like to see the trails, walking, running, etc. be done first. This property is just sitting there and we, the people who live near by, could be using it now!
- Plant more trees!
- Plant some grapes for wine making!
- Make an environmental statement to all and incorporate solar power cells to generate power for on site use and cost savings. Also, install a water reclamation/recycling system for irrigation.
- Plant a variety of fruit trees to commemorate the agricultural history and heritage of this Valley. For example, cherry, plums, apricot, peaches, etc. The blossoms will pay homage to the farmers who once thrived here.
- My house borders the park on the west side. I bought the house because of the beautiful view of the field and the mountains in the distance. My main concern is that I do not lose my view into the park with any type of tall or solid fencing. The current chain link fence allows a clear view into the property. A solid or chain link fence laced with wooden slats would obscure that view.
- As an answer to the security and privacy constraints mentioned in the master plan for adjoining properties, I would like to suggest that the perimeter trail not run along the western edge. Instead, if there were crops along the western edge, that would provide a physical buffer keeping visitors...
away from the fence, but also allowing the fence to remain chain link, which would preserve homeowners’ views into the park.

- The entire evening was really presented well by all. Thank you.
- I like the water feature in Plans A & C.
- Pedestrian trails are important
- Plenty of western pedestrian entrances important
- Farmers market would be nice.
- The equestrian facility should be passive and very educational. This would include wagon work, and horseshoeing and veterinarian work.
- Option B also shows 4-H facilities that are necessary for a complete agricultural educational facility.
- The pond is a wonderful feature that needs to be included.
- More land should be set aside for the produce stand and farmers market.
- Fruits and vegetables grown on-site should remain organic.
- More on-site parking needs to be included for the benefit of the neighborhood.
- I hope the visitor center will talk about Mr. Lester and his vision. Also, additional community room in the visitor center for classes on gardening, recycling. Rooms for rent for other community events.
- We must generate $ to sustain this large park and all the bills that need to be paid!
- No horses
- Lake if it stays filled with water
- “A” is a good plan – lots of walkways – move entrance to Chynoweth
- Farmers market – great!
- “B” second choice
- The three plans were a surprise – it seems like they pushed adverse conditions – bad access points in A & B and too spread out and illogical layout B are too close to homes. C is clearly the best plan – safest entrance, compact focus, preserves views, lovely water feature. And no dog park – yays!
- Do not want neighborhood access points – a way for burglars to run away or kids to get in park without adults.
- How about a horse riding trail? Hourly rental?
- Lots of big shade trees
- I would like to see some mix of Plan B & C.
- I like the water feature because of the existing wildlife. I like pedestrian access all around.
- I love the farmers market idea but again, not embedded into the neighborhood.
- No horses! Our neighborhood residents generally don’t own/keep horses. To open this park to horse trailers is to invite residents of other neighborhoods who keep horses (Almaden? Morgan Hill? Woodside?) into our little neighborhood park. No! This needs to be our park, serving the VistaPark / Blossom Valley neighborhood.
- Focus on original agricultural use and pedestrian neighbor access (walking/jogging). This is also in keeping with the spirit of Cilker Park, Almaden Lake Park, and the surrounding Vasona trails. Maximize trails for walking!
- No outdoor pavilion! Too noisy! Wrong functional use (pavilion-type events have plenty of other local venues in San Jose). Keep this park simple. Focus on history, learning, meditation, discovery.
- No fishing! What an absurd idea! Fishing in a neighborhood park. Odd. So many other “real” fishing locations to go. Inconsistent with original agricultural use/vision.
- Where is active composting, display and activities?
- I would love to see a working farm with a large farmers market. I do not necessarily want a lot of trails and access with dog parks and recreational activities. I think the donor’s wishes are clear, simple. I am thinking more of an open market with fresh produce (fresh from the farm). Will you
have 4-H help? I really do not want lots of access, traffic – focus on farm, not recreational activities and trails.

- Inspirations – Slow Food Movement, San Francisco Ferry Building Farmers Market
- Include VTA station bridge in the final design. This allows easy access from the light rail to the park.
- All alternatives should have a farmers market.
- Be able to rent out horses to ride on the trail.
- Go fishing in the lake.
- All of the alternatives should have a café.
- You should have an entrance all around the park so it is accessible for everyone.
- I really like the idea of having as many foot entrances as possible.
- We like Plan A, however with main entrance into park from Branham Lane
- Plan B should have a water pond to provide water for the migratory birds, and it also will have the streamline for farming uses.
- Plan A has a new road for cars to come in, it is totally redundant because Branham & Chynoweth are enough for traffic. Please make the road to a trail for better use of land.
- Need to be safe (restrict access). Avoid late night dwellers in park. Security is necessary but it still be accessible. Vasona is a good example as being secured.
- Need to have lots of miles of trails.
- Need to incorporate farmers market.
- Like youth agriculture center in Alternative A
- Alternative A spreads out parking based on recreational [use]
- Adding a traffic light on Snell will slow down speeders on Snell. Big problem.
- See comments on maps
- Concern about restricting access from all locations when Park is closed or off-limits? Fences around perimeter.
- Security after hours?
- Preference for Alternative C
- I think caretaker S/B required
- Rats and mice control during construction.
- Like Alternative A
- Would like more trails around leased farming areas
- Add farmers market to “A” could be once a week and use existing parking.
- Need security or locked gates to keep vandals and kids out. Exposure to drinking, drugs, etc.
- Please minimize auto roads (why I don’t like “A”). The big attraction of this park is as an “oasis” away from pavement and cars!
- Prefer picnic areas and walking trails are important. I prefer not to have equestrian trails – interfere with walking and probably too small for riding.
- I like Plan C but would like to see a dog park. Our neighborhood doesn’t have a nearby dog park.
- I prefer the park does not have an equestrian facility, and that all dogs be on-leash.
- I would like a walk-in entrance on Chynoweth.
- I’d like to see an entrance on the west side of Chynoweth for pedestrian walk-in only. No vehicles.
- No berms, please. No road through whole park, please.
- I like agriculture of “C”, natural resources of “B,” recreation and community/visitor use of “B”, and access of “B”
- I prefer meandering trail on perimeter.
- Concerned about attracting more geese due to pond/lake.
- Area should be fenced and well-lit to keep out drug users and criminals at night.
- Prefer Alternative A plan. Would a main entrance on Chynoweth be the best/least traffic impact?
- The traffic could also back-up if entry is on Snell. While there are some residential areas off Chynoweth, it is wide enough to handle more traffic and would not cause back-ups on major through street.
- I like the lake or water feature located by the creek. I want more orchards in commercial area. I also like organic community gardens, native plant nursery, and farmers market.
- Until the historic farm is available, I hope there will be some historic boards and displays in a visitor center or pavilion.
- With all entries, consider access and transport for less mobile population. The Branham entry configuration is especially bad for handicapped people.
- Please try to maximize public use. Agricultural use gives the public almost nothing – that is what the San Joaquin valley is for. I think the donor would want people to use the park, not just look at open space.
- Are the fences coming off? They should, at least around the perimeter.
- I like how A is spread out but prefer entrance on Chynoweth. Lake would be nice but alternative would be grass/tree/picnic areas
- No dog park
- No equestrian needed
- Like farmers market/meeting area/community center
- On Plan A, I don’t like the road down the middle – have a walking path.
- I would like to meander by foot or bicycle and be able to observe the farming process as it occurs.
- Would the plowing and harvesting involve large equipment like harvesters? Would it create much dust to surrounding homes? I’m not particularly opposed to either but some people may be.
- Thank you to the Cottle Family and Mr. Lester. Your heritage is our heritage.
- Like C very much, but like the wetlands in B.
- Love youth agriculture and demo gardens in A
- Like mostly trails, little roads for driving
- Use Master Gardeners
- Hands-on for kids – crafts of the past, farming, farming tools, animals, food preparation
- I really like the dog park/picnic/trails through middle of Alternative A, but I picked Alternative B as my first choice because of the location of farmers market, etc.
- I like the seasonal wetland, community gardens, community college partnership, research, historic farm equipment demonstrations very important
- No fishing, please, but Alternative B needs a pond. Is seasonal wetland replacing it?
- U-pick crops would be fun.
- Please no buildings at Snell & Branham – already high traffic area because of commercial activity.
- Entrance on Branham would encourage parking in Safeway lot by park visitors.
- VistaPark corner tends to flood – good to keep “development” away – but doesn’t seem to grow vegetation as well.
- Need lots of pedestrian entry points to encourage and enable local residents to walk to park rather than drive.
- Dog park is okay, but must be a distance away from walking trails or major pathways.
- Community garden space(s) should be significantly larger.
- Pond/water feature is highly desirable.
- Youth agriculture area is highly desirable
- Equestrian area – I believe – will cater to a small number of people.
- Farmers market highly desirable
- Operational vineyard, maybe a small winery (in keeping with history of this area)
• “A” is good but entrance should be off Branham – currently has a “control light” already in place. Also, I do not see on any of the plans where the wildlife that has been present is allowed to flourish.
• “A” – Instead of farm equipment yard, which is optional, have farmers market at this point. (Keeping traffic in and out at the same point) Also have native plant nursery if items for sale near market.
• “A” – access is the best for those riding light rail, walking to featured areas.
• “A” – I like lake but would rather have seasonal wetlands. The lake attracts geese, which are messy and attract rats/unwanted creatures.
• Please have multiple walk-in accesses for people living nearby so they won’t drive to the park and create more traffic and make walking trails open and safe for all. Equestrian use and a dog park would be fun – will be interesting to see how you could work that – horse trails should be separate – usually dirt for ease of clean-up and safety of animals.
• Park perimeter: tall trees with low shrubs
• Lake: big enough with flowing water to prevent mosquitoes – add fish
• Petting zoo: goats, sheep, small animals
• Nursery: Tall bamboos in perimeter
• Large farmers market
• There should also be additional entrance/exits along Branham & Snell with smaller parking lots for specific areas or functions, possibly at the ends of Vistapark and Chynoweth. I would like to see a mixture of C and B.
• Alternative A – like it because it brings people into middle of park.
• Strongly support any hands-on use by young people
• Road should connect to 2 Chynoweth roads
• Entire Chynoweth side should be open to pedestrians without any fences
• No isolated lake
• No dog area
• The Master Gardeners would like time to present our vision of the demo gardens and research plots. Hope this can be arranged before concrete planning is done. Also, check out Full Circle Farm in Santa Clara for a current, newly installed operation.
• Bike trails are fine, but they should be separate from the walking trails. From the walker’s perspective, it is difficult to enjoy a good walk, when you have to dodge and wade high speed bicycles. Please make pedestrian-only trails, preferably with non-paved areas. “Multi-use” trails are bad for both walkers and bicyclists.
• No swimming or use of the lake
• I like Plan A with water features. Plan B with wetlands good. Plan B seems not very centralized in relation to other features.
• Hopefully trails will separate pedestrian traffic from bicycles, might be a safety concern with bikes. Can bicycles and equestrians share?
• Farmers market in all plans, please.
• Any guidelines on farming, like organic only?
• We would like to use a portion of the community garden for Girl Scouts and Boy Scouts. Our intention is to have the Scouts plan, plant, and harvest crop. Crops will be donated to local charitable organizations and/or neighboring retirement home, Carlton. This will teach Scouts leadership, community involvement, farming techniques and donations.
• Should there be more than one entrance/exit for safety?
• I like Almaden Lake Park. It would be nice to keep the good features of that park in mind when planning this one.
• Farmer’s Market would be great all year
- Need paved trails that are smooth enough for roller blades
- NO DOG PARK
- NO HORSES
- If there is a pond – no fishing
- Will there be limits on pesticide use? Could impact neighbors
- Will there be public restrooms?
- Paid day parking inside park
- Need much more community garden space
- Keep true to donor’s vision of agriculture
- Farmer’s Market
- Night access to permitted trail should be restricted
- Perimeter trail access on Vista Park should not encourage parking that could spill over into neighborhoods.
- Should neighborhood residences be concerned with use of pesticides on agricultural crops/plants inside the Park? Organic farms preferred
- We really like the option to include the farmer’s market
- Native plants attract the beautiful hummingbirds of California and should be included
- Prefer a meandering trail rather than straight perimeter trails.
- Need a preferred layout with options
- Prefer Plan “B” with lake
- Prefer Plan “C” entrance
- Prefer interior perimeter trail (dirt) and external perimeter trail paved
- Have a board of directors of local neighbors (adults, children, merchants, gardeners), so that there can be a strategic plan update every 5 years. It will remain a “living” plot of land, and be relevant to the changing neighborhoods.
- Emergency procedures and mass shelter for the neighbors
- Low-lying bushes along perimeter so that the beautiful hills can be seen. We want to continue to see the snow on the hills.
- Encourage neighbors to grow items in their own yards that compliment the agriculture at the Park.
- Grow ethnic vegetables in a specific area of the land at all times. This would be relevant to our community diversity.
- Beer hives
- I like the creek restoration and native plants.
- Locating the farmer’s market at Snell and Branham
- Mules and horses used in the farming process
- Pedestrian access not just for autos
- Can there be goats as part of the agricultural experience?
- Cheese making
- Chickens and coops
- Organic farmers need to be protected from neighborhoods overspray of pesticides
- Need for livestock for organic philosophy of integration (i.e. goats, chickens, sheep, rabbits, bees.)
- Greenhouse (Conservatory)
- Need for a children’s garden
- Swimming pool for kids
- At this point, Plan A seems to be the best alternative. The idea of having a restroom is very good.
- Lake/pond is very important. Fishing
- Meandering trails are better than straight roads for recreational trail use.
- Trees and bushes along trail.
- Consider connections to external trails (e.g. Guadalupe River Trail)
• Consider security, neighborhood nuisance factors
• Take over role of County Fairgrounds for agriculture/ livestock fairs. Need display facilities.
• I prefer the layout of Plan C with the centralized parking area. I would like to preserve the historical flatland look with no berms. A low buffer to block the view of the Park is not desirable to me. I’d prefer a lined park.
• I’d prefer 100 ft. setback distance between perimeter roads and trails.
• I like the mix of trails on the perimeter.
• I would like tennis courts at the Chynoweth end of the overflow parking.
• Would like access to the Park restricted to certain hours only.
• Include pedestrian access points
• Don’t want people to be in the Park to cause trouble. This is also for safety reasons. Also security would be good for the public.
• PG&E lines
• Concerns about pesticides
• What type of road improvements will be made on Chynoweth
• Parking, etc. on Chynoweth
• Walk in access on Chynoweth
• Trails should meander – no straight “landing strips.”
• Parcourse for stretching/exercise
• Medical Marijuana – help with money
• Keep dog park
• Community gardens
• Visitor center
• Love Plan A
• Community involvement with planting
• Like farmer’s market to purchase produce. Include herbs
• Visitor Center – good with pictures
• Tall or short trees on perimeter
• Walking trails; lighted undercrossing to Blossom Hill
• Water fountains; fountain in middle of man made lake
• Benches facing lake
• Concession food stand during possible events like art festivals, pumpkin festivals, music festivals, Indian pow wows, Easter egg hunts, etc.
• What’s happening to the foxes seen roaming there?
• Easy access for the Senior Home residents nearby
• Entrance on Snell Ave – A
• Entrance on Chynoweth – C
• Total parking 400 and 25 horse trailer – C
• 11 pedestrian entrances – A
• Meandering perimeter trail – C
• 2.25 miles of internal trails – A
• Large arena and pasture 5 acres – C
• Visitor center complex includes multi use hall – C
• Caretakers – C
• Large lake or pond with fishing – C
• Native plan nursery – C
• Master lessor w/ lessees – C
• Community garden 1 acre to 3 acres – A & C
• Produce stand at entrance – A
• Farmer’s market – C
• Plan C important items: lake on pond with fishing income (producing charges for fish caught)
• Farmer’s market
• More trails
• Caretakers residence
• Pedestrian traffic access from Vista Park
• Farm equipment demonstrated for visiting school groups.
• If there is a lake there must be a plan to control the geese.
• Concerns regarding 24/7 security at entrances and for animals. Who will take care of the gardens? And pay fees [collect fees]? Who runs the café? Is 4-H involved
• No swimming at lake?
• How much lighting at night
• Capacity of meeting rooms?
• Demonstration gardens need to be by entrances for visibility of education and sales
• Community involvement in planting Park
• How many caretakers and security will be involved during the day and then at night?
• Café to use produce and fruit from farm
• Keep the fox
• Rest areas on walking paths – how many bathrooms?
• I have been waiting for 36 years to have a neighborhood park. This is very exciting. I am please that there will be no recreational sports activities. However, I would like to have as much access as possible to all areas of the park via meandering trails throughout. I like the water features, but would like to see the pond large enough to attract wildlife.
• I think a farmer’s market and “pick your own” orchards and fields would be great and would be in line with the donor’s wishes. Access to walking trails and the Park is important perhaps 3 along each side.
• While preserving the agricultural heritage of the Park, I truly feel that the second most important use is to serve the neighborhoods surrounding the Park itself. Many of us have lived there for a long time and have never had a neighborhood park within walking distances (especially those in the area near Del Roble school).
• Make buffer zone by the west side residences a minimum of 50 yards.
• Farm animals and positively horses
• Golf carts with volunteers to police area and provide helpful advice or suggestions.
• Small rectangle (Plan B) farms to grow various items. Community, families, school projects, etc.
• Concessions
• Trains
• Shade
• Outside auditorium
• Good to have a yoga and meditation center so that people will take yoga classes and practice yoga.
• The fishing opportunity is great for children and adults
• If you make an entrance from Chynoweth, we need a separate parkway type, well covered by trees so the residences will not even notice the difference.
• Want community involvement in implementation
• Security
• Want organic vegetables
• Snell Ave
• Vineyards
• More parking
• Emergency area
• Equestrian
• Will there be enough water?
• I think Mr. Lester wanted an open agriculture area.
• The trees are nice but don’t overdo the trees on Branham. I would hate to lose the openness.
• We have foxes and white heron in the spring that come to this open space. I want to be able to still see them (not a farm equipment shed/area on the Branham side of the Park, or a bunch of trees blocking the view.”
• I also think there should be an agricultural theatre and museum to give visitors the history of San Jose/S.C. valley as a great agricultural area at one time.
• I want the park to be a learning and teaching experience.
• Also, with global warming worries, I want to emphasize ecology in the park, so a teaching building is important where teachers can bring their class for a field trip.
• I would like to see a store, like the Cottage Shoe on Almaden Expressway, where we can go in, get advice and buy California native plants.
• I would also like seminars on how to cook with the food made at the Park.
• An all year indoor/outdoor market place to buy fresh fruit, veggies like Case de Fruita.
• Thanks for all this involvement and planning. I’m mostly concerned that wildlife (primarily birds who use the land as a migratory rest-stop) should be protected and encouraged to thrive/use the land. Can we set up a habitat that will draw them down?
• But watch out for Niles-virus bearing mosquito life in those wetlands and regenerated vegetation along Canoas Creek.
• Restrooms – how many, or how far apart – one minute from main one at pavilion/visitor center?
• Will equestrian parking lot be separate from regular cars?
• Separate entrance for equestrian parking?
• I like the meandering trails on [Alternative] “C” combined with total parking from [Alternative] “B” with pedestrian entrances between “C” and “B” and entrance on Chynoweth.
• I like the community garden – would households have a plot of land to work or lottery to see who gets to plant?
• Flora to attract butterflies and hummingbirds
• Not sure about dog park – fleas, attacks, poop, etc.
• Equestrian uses: lessons, competitions, therapy riding, young veterinarians
• Farmers market is important
• My family lives in the area (Skyway & Snell) which involves the Martial Cottle Master Plan. I would offer my input that Alternative A is what we see as the best option best. We like the longer walking path, the dog park and a smaller equestrian center.
• I would discourage a road through the park as depicted in Plan A. The road would end up using a large percentage of the available land. Also, with the distributed parking depicted in Plan A, at any given time, it’s likely some areas will have insufficient parking while other areas have spaces available. If the roads are minimized and the parking consolidated there is maximum area for the agricultural features of the park.
October 23, 2008 Community Workshop #2
Draft Meeting Summary
Attachment 3

This attachment provides a summary of Activities 2 and 3 of the breakout groups. For Activity 2, each participant was given a blue dot to attach to the alternative that best fit their vision and a green dot to attach to the alternative that almost met their vision. For Activity 3, Participants recorded their comments directly on the alternative graphics, and facilitators also took notes on flip-up charts. Images of each alternative graphic are provided below, following the summary of the dot exercise and comments.

Activity 2: Dots
Participants voted with their dots as follows:
- Alternative A: 59 blue, 31 green
- Alternative B: 31 blue, 42 green
- Alternative C: 27 blue, 41 green

Activity 3: Comments
There were many qualifying comments written onto the graphics. For instance, many people favored a particular alternative IF the entrance was moved to a different location. In general, the following elements were favored by comments and in some cases participants recommended that these elements be expanded:
- Farmers Market
- Trails
- Community Gardens
- Historic design and elements
- Some form of lake
- Canoas Creek channel enhancement and revegetation
- Meandering trails
- Botanical/native plant gardens
- Native plant nursery
- Orchards
- Beneficial wildlife habitat

Participants shared contrasting views of the advantages and disadvantages of the following elements:
- Location of the entrance. Participants sited pros and cons of each entrance, most related to visibility and traffic. Whether it would be more advantageous to have the entrance on a street with higher existing traffic volumes or a “quieter” street was not agreed upon. Contrasting views were also recorded on the merits of locating the entrance at the existing signal on Branham across from the Safeway parking lot.
- Equestrian Uses. Many notes were made about equestrian uses, some strongly in favor of expanding equestrian facilities/use areas and other strongly opposed to the inclusion of equestrian uses.
- Dogs/Dog Park. Similar to comments received on equestrian uses.
- Meandering main road versus condensed park uses. Numerous comments were made in favor of meandering road and distributed activities as well as for condensed park uses. In some cases, the same participant was in favor of both situations. While none of the alternatives showed a meandering road to condensed park area, this can be considered as a possibility.
Alternative A
Alternative B
FLIP-UP CHART ADDITIONAL NOTES

Station #1

- Equestrian Use
- Clarification of use (4H, etc), how many facilities within a specific radius
- Boarding
- Alternative A
  - Lots of walking trails
  - More use of whole space
- Internal Lighting? Hours of operation?
- Farmers Market
- Want a vineyard, but could attract vandals
- Secured gates at entrance?
- Will there be locked gates at night?
- Problem of vagrants at night.
- Will there be enough water for year-round irrigated agriculture and will farmers pay for the water?
- What are the potential revenues for each of the alternatives?
- Like the Community Building
- Frost dates (Dec. 15 – Mar. 15)
- Community Workdays

Station #2

ENTRANCES

Snell
- Less Neighbors
- Major Street

Branham
- Proximity to Safeway
- Existing light
- Traffic
- Park on busy corner

Chynoweth
- Donor’s Vision
- Trailer turn around/pull in
- Less busy – safer access
- Homes don’t face road
- Quieter – No through Traffic
- Near Farmer’s Market – Traffic
- Shorter Trees – Buffer
- Dog Park – Mess
- Café – Not Historic, Perhaps Food Stand for large events (concessions)
  - Doesn’t fit with park
  - Other Café’s nearby
• IDEA: Tilled land along Perimeter trail
  Road    Farm    Trail

• Cooking Demonstrations:
  (Master Gardeners)

Station #3

Pond feature will attract more birds (+)

Station #4

• Parking along Chynoweth
  Leaves more land for farming
• Don’t want activities/traffic near homes
• Activity grouped near already busy intersection
• Likes passive recreation
• Like public access by foot
• Branham access – already busy
• Equestrian great for neighborhood kids
• Dog Park
• Plan B – but with Lake! – several people!
• More economically viable when visible
• Equestrians boarded near center away from homes
• No pesticides
• Youth agricultural section
• Horse Area not too efficient use of space, since there is no overnight. Who’s going to bring their horses for the day?
• Access on Branham doesn’t impact neighborhoods if lake, control geese

Plan A (because of lake and trails), but access on Branham access - #1 Branham (already commercial), and 2nd Snell (back of homes)

Plan B

• Activities near Life Estate, (future attraction)
• More space for community gardens
• Farmers need space away from activities
• Perimeter trail
• With Branham widened, historic farm equipment displayed – could be active
• Don’t want parking in neighborhoods (e.g. near Carlton Senior Facility)
• Night access for walking trails? (we’d prefer no access after dark on the trails.)
• Chynoweth access okay for neighbors, but not public
• A real teaching garden
• Ecology education, green building
• Sustainability - Education for children
• A resource for agricultural information
• Public restrooms, and for farm workers
• Native plants/habitats – education
• Wildlife? Beekeeping?
Station #5

- Dog Park
- Horses
- Pedestrian Access
- PG&E Lines along Snell
- Closure of Park during non-operating hours
- More Pedestrian Trails for Pedestrians and Dogs!!
- Provide a Lake!! Great idea!
- Volunteer Opportunities
- Safety
- Vineyards

Station #6

- Parking
- Youth Agriculture
- Branham Ave. Widening
- Pedestrian Access
- Farmer’s Market
- Equestrian Facility
- Public Restrooms