Small Group Notes: Transcribed and organized by subject line. When in doubt, item moved to “GENERAL” category.

GENERAL

- Many group members concerned with D Street – Davidon Property – at risk of development
- Also known as: Scott Ranch/Kelly Creek – 58 acres, Red Barn. “Kelly Creek Protection & Preservation Project”
- Red-Legged Frog – endangered species – present on property and along creek
- Group looking to build local partnerships to expand Helen Putnam Regional Park
- Helen Putnam Park, an asset to citizens, is adjacent to Davidon
- Sonoma Land Trust has funds to preserve ($1 million) – would like to see if District can help protect this land
- Protect trails & hiking opportunities
- Would like to see more partnerships between conservation & recreation
- Preserve urban Growth Boundaries, stop urban sprawl
- Preserve plants and animals, keep environment healthy
- Focus on keeping agricultural infrastructure intact
- Sonoma Mountain -- Property (easement) owner since 2009 appreciates that landowners can steward their own land.
- Petaluma resident concern about status of Lafferty Ranch
- Where is it going?
- Urban greenways and wildlife corridors; impacts of transportation corridors
- Climate change and adaptation; wildlife corridors; ag protection
- Is agriculture getting fair share of District focus and resources?
- Protection of Sonoma Development Center
- Don’t want to see runaway urbanization; protection of natural/cultural/ag landscapes close to Sonoma
- Retention of open space within Sonoma and directly adjacent; not losing to housing needs pressure
- Adronico Vallejo Adobe Preservation (see handout) – preservation of historic cultural resource; songbird habitat; riparian zone
- Watershed – for salmonids, stream flows
- Outreach to interest groups not always in sync with District
- [ Specific Private Property ] Leveroni/5th Street West (N.W. corner) property
- Sonoma Development Center wildlife corridor
- Threat – State drive to recoup costs of infrastructure repair/replacement
- Community needs to come together to protect/direct
- Hwy 12 north of Springs area – sprawl northward towards Kenwood
- Groundwater recharge; unchannelize waterways; saltwater intrusion in Sonoma Valley
- Ag practices/strategies to protect natural resources and groundwater
- Winery events
- More resources towards easement enforcement and stewardship; preventing trespass
- Clearer policies on who can access properties and how/when
- Public outreach to clarify when public access is not permitted or not main focus of District acquisitions
- Education and public access to ensure confirmed support for District when up for reauthorization
- Urban and urban fringe agriculture – identify and protect
- Revisit “forever wild” area and evaluate whether brush is encroaching
- Concern – Development in Sonoma Valley
- Stricter planning is needed
- Montini project is a great example

Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.
• Highway 12 no longer scenic
• What will happen to Sonoma Development Center?
• Wildlife habitat loss (e.g., Steelhead)
• View corridor needs to be protected
• Protect habitat, wildlife corridor
• Create corridors for people – bike path from Sonoma to Santa Rosa
• Bike path – Glen Ellen (Madrone Road to Dunbar Road) – Pathways for general public rather than long-distance bikers
• Leave Calabazas as wild as possible
• Sonoma Valley becoming congested
• Conversion of ranchland to vineyards – becoming a monoculture
• Pressure for new housing
• Issue: how can people keep their land
• Want to keep as much open space as possible – wild places and ag
• What is going to happen to the Sonoma Development Center property?
• How can groundwater sustainability planning efforts capture economic value of groundwater?
• At risk for exporting our natural resources – “carpet bagging”
• Salt water intrusion on properties in southern Sonoma County
• Concerned about waterways and their quality
• Concerned about wildlife – agriculture is encroaching on this
• Overconsumption of natural resources
• Will Lafferty be established as a public access park? Currently there’s no public access.
• Sonoma County (Sonoma Mountain) resident concerned about erosion issues
• Partner with county to solve agricultural problems
• Looking for more landowner resources
• Encourage people to be in natural environment (urban & rural)
• Thinks Roseland Park is a good example of multiple-community benefit
• Would like to see more projects like Bayer Neighborhood Park
• New resident appreciates agriculture
• “Agrihood” – Agriculture interspersed in neighborhood
• Does CE lower property tax and property value? Concerned about high property taxes
• Paulin Creek open space is in imminent danger
• Vineyard conversions
• Preservation of nature
• Urban open space – keep development in check
• Access to rec lands
• Access to open space
• Protection of viewscapes, RRD zoning (protection of hillsides)
• Protection of ag land from commercial “ag-on-ag” land development
• Getting more access to lands under protection
• Paulin Creek Preserve – sign indicates that it’s protected but it’s not
• S.E. Greenway – conservation efforts, protection of community separators (keep as open space, excluding ag)
• McMurry Ranch on Westside Road
• Vineyards – a potential threat, particularly when event centers are concerned
• Commercialization of ag land that changes the character of the land and also alters views
• Cities: Growing up vs out
• Fountaingrove as an example of the alteration of an original development plan

Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.
• Different types of conservation easements?
• Easement language/terms to ensure protection
• Oak woodlands need protection, and also water
• Riparian corridor, waterways for protection, including for wildlife
• Russian River access (not a threat – a desire!).
• Connections between communities to areas for hiking, biking, etc in urban areas and countywide as alternatives to roads with traffic
• Open space with opportunities for connecting pathways
• Building of trails for hiking & biking on District-protected lands
• More public access will ensure more education and more value to the land (connecting areas – see Howard Moes as a good example – he was a volunteer steward for LandPaths & OSD)
• Wilderness preserves with no human access for benefit of non-human species
• Open space access in So. County
• Long-distance viewsheds – hillsides without development, redwoods, e.g., Petaluma Hill Road
• Views from Hwy 101
• Agricultural valleys – (differentiate) – e.g, protect oak woods in valleys to maintain existing highly visible viewsheds
• Threat: vineyards to water sources, groundwater basins, forests
• Youth education – iNaturalist as a resource
• 1-a) Establish goals for increasing carbon
• Need to improve Paulin Creek access
• Get rid of poison oak at Paulin
• OSD should follow up with City of Santa Rosa on Paulin Creek for access and maintenance
• Managing grazing lands
• 1-b) Rotational grazing; encouraging perennial grasses and trees
• Consider more $$ for maintenance and stewardship and access rather than acquisition
• Preserve our rural sense of place
• No event centers
• Easements for riparian and flood plains protection; corridors are too narrow.
• Honor Paulin Creek Preserve as a preserve
• Have OSD advocate for Paulin
• Paulin Creek is a wetland; importance of wetland and native oaks
• OSD should be calling importance of Paulin to Board of Supervisors
• Trail plans multi-use be the default
• Wildlife corridors – maintain diversity; some areas just for wildlife and productivity of wildlife corridors
• Water trails: Russian River, Gualala, Petaluma, Sonoma Creek
• Connectivity – OSD evaluate holdings. Facilitate user-friendly active transportation
• Do not develop Sonoma Coast
• Threat – sale of Paulin Creek
• Threat – cannabis industry/water use
• Keep more land available for crops
• Would like to see trails with agriculture
• Agricultural diversity – encouraging!
• More work in Skaggs Springs/Gualala River area
• Atascadero Creek – protect area
• Some concerned with potential development on English Hill, La Cresta Ridge
• Currently provides a connection from downtown to Helen Putnam

Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.
• The swath of land provides a wildlife corridor, recreation, natural areas
• Group wants smart infill development that is transit-oriented/access-oriented
• Preserving greenbelts, buffers around cities, community character, wildlife habitat
• Form partnerships with schools to foster future stewards
• Outings on District-protected land
• Help at-risk student connect with parks
• Connect outdoor spaces with urban centers
• Programs/Electives in secondary schools
• Partner with S.T.R.A.W., B-RAD Foundation
• Trailhead for HPRP @ D Street & Windsor
• Lafferty – reopen for public access (Sonoma Mountain)
• Try to replicate N.Y. conservation tax credit for ag landowners
• Make people more aware of conservation easement program
• Reworking of initial public access funding – provide more funding to parks for O&M
• More District-protected land in south county
• Vital Lands = Vital Communities
• Value ability to park and camp
• Less expensive camping
• Looking for hike/bike opportunities
• More backcountry camping
• Within urban development, find and protect wild areas before they are developed
• Target properties that are connected for trails and wildlife.
• More access to open space for multi-use
• BARPTC-like connect
• Shortage of access for recreation to open-space lands
• Imbalance of supply and demand as root cause of user issues and threats – e.g., conflicts, volunteer trails
• Same as above
• Envis #1
• Recreation – riding mountain bikes – open space views
• Happy with number of protected so far
• Balance is important
• Want to continue balance with consideration for housing
• Wine, scenic beauty, weather ??
• Open space, hiking
• Impacts to neighborhoods from open public spaces – number of people
• Loves wild Sonoma County natural diversity
• Loves closeness of Regional Parks to Tierra Veg.
• Scenic beauty, rec, ag, biodiversity
• Connection to preservation by rec
• Carbon farming via ag preservation
• Active ag production and management
• Habitat rest and preservation – lots of open spaces are degraded
• Habitat enhancement education opportunities
• South County access
• Organic farming – food security
• Regenerative ag – local consumption

Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.
• Coastal trails & connectivity
• Public access to see why protection is important
• Recreation – multi-use
• Urban greenways connecting existing and connecting urban to other parks and protected lands
• Riparian enhancement – concerned about existing infrastructure in riparian zones
• Buffers and need for protection of water
• Coastal prairie
• Aquifer recharge
• Coastal trails for hiking and riding bikes
• Oak woodland important to SOD
• Protecting soil from erosion and scenic hillsides
• Vineyard expansion – threats to oak woodlands and other agriculture
• Value of mixed farming, ag diversity within an area
• Agricultural sustainability
• Urban sprawl and exurban sprawl threatens open space
• Connectivity locally
• Water availability and protection
• Funding for Regional Parks’ Parks Measure
• Bureaucratic challenges for correcting inappropriate land management
• Damage to sensitive habitats because of a lack of response by District on fee land
• Matching Grant Program support MGP with natural elements
• Reauthorization – messaging
• Good logo for initiative – messaging connections with partners (LandPaths, Regional Parks, etc.)
• Bring all partners together under one identity for messaging
• Rec also important
• Lack of access could affect future vote on tax
• Value of open space – it’s why we live here
• Beauty, connectivity, multi-use
• Likes open space within community urban area
• Paulin Creek – likes its proximity to open space
• Ditto on preserving urban open space
• Community separators
• Preserving scenic vistas (seeing from city to O/S like Taylor Mountain)
• Education is important – People need to know how the money can be spent per Measure F Expenditure Plan
• District [?] can’t develop beyond a certain point
• Echoes comment on vistas that can be seen from town
• Echoes wants access – wants to be involved in who SCAPOSD transfers property to, e.g., Jenner – would be safer with more access
• There are people willing to see how it all works (others manage their lands and how the CE is crafted)
• Rec should be negotiated as part of an easement over a certain number of acres
• Echo limited access leads to user conflicts and other issues
• Pockets of open space that aren’t linked so folks have to drive – wants to see links, get people out of their cars
• Win/win to partner with JC for volunteers
• Supplement staff
• Southeast Greenway
• Sonoma Development Center

Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.
• Wetlands between Willowside and Piner (for sale)
• SCWA parcel “N” – 26 acres near Paulin Creek
• On 12 near Melita on the right (heading to Sonoma) – southeast – link to Annadel
• Highway 12 Sonoma Valley bike trail
• Eliminate fences and barriers between properties to allow kids access
• Provide more background on what the District has done in south county.
• Agency partnerships with wildlife corridors
• Lafferty Ranch – Progress and protection concerns
• Ag priority
• Integrate ag and open space – traffic concerns
• Dairy belt – community separators
• Development of D Street and Windsor and Victoria subdivision, extend Helen Putnam Park
• Bike trail from Sebastopol to Petaluma – Rails to Trails SoCo Regional Parks project
• Less monoculture
• Preservation of redwood trees
• Funding – raise more – acquisitions
• Wildlife corridors
• Use ag and conservation easement – term “easement” is confusing
• More community separators – ongoing loss of community separators
• Ranches are open space
• Open Space District to help young farmers
• Affirmative ag easements – need more
• Affirmative requirements related to wildlife habitat & corridors
• Differentiating intoxicate grows vs. food
• Food priorities
• Heritage foods
• Mutual benefits of ag and wildlife
• Corona Reach – North Petaluma River – groundwater recharge
• Protect Liberty Valley – Marin watershed
• Protect Laguna de Santa Rosa headwaters
• Protect Sonoma Developmental Center – wildlife corridor, watershed
• Protect San Pablo Bay and Bay lands – reclaim/convert ag land into marsh
• Arnold Scott Ranch – D Street, Davidon
• Need to preserve open space in West Petaluma Hills, La Cresta property near Hayes Lane (?), including the wildlife corridor there (habitat for diverse mammals, birds, and red-legged frog), and also near water tank
• Need areas that are less developed, with less traffic, for bicycling
• Threat: overuse of wineries (e.g., events)
• Engagement (?)
• Petaluma River – need more trails and public access
• Limit development, keep more open space – especially hillsides around Petaluma and south to maintain views
• Need a well-conceived process for transfer of fee lands. The current process is too slow and there are issues with master plans and the timing of O&M funds.
• Equestrian community – Proper land use, coexistence with other forms of rec, train maintenance issues (process is too slow), land adjacent to Helen Putnam Park
• Kelly Creek area
• Housing crisis – 951 [Petaluma?] Blvd South

Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.
• Need for balancing open space and housing needs
• Increasing population is threat
• Need more lands where people can camp overnight, especially for youth (e.g., for Scouts). Need to engage youth more since they are the future.
• Threat: Proposed housing along the Petaluma River, an asphalt plant, and other development in this area.
• Lafferty Ranch – desire for public access. Political will is needed to open it.
• Promote connectivity of lands for public access (can attract tourists and generate revenue)
• West Petaluma Hills – important wildlife corridor, connects to other key habitat areas. Cited: Paula Lane – American badger.
• The portfolio of protected lands is unbalanced in south county – there’s a lack of accessible parks. Areas cited for protection: Ridgetop and west side of Sonoma Mountain, Petaluma River Corona Reach floodplain, valley oaks, grasslands
• North end of Petaluma Marsh – Dutra asphalt plant property (south side of river, east of 101)
• Riparian corridors
• Focus should be on balancing public access with wildlife areas (protected habitat)
• Threat to corridors: fencing
• North section of Petaluma River – agricultural area needs protection
• Taylor Mountain cited as a successful model
• Distribution of funds: District 2 needs to see more benefits in proportion to funds collected
• Lack of access for rec in north county
• Mark West: People are looking forward to it being opened to the public
• Contract issues: First right of refusal for purchasing; first right to develop trail system.
• Rails to Trails: Needs District involvement
• Open space/parks like Forestville Park – urban open space
• Balance between open space and affordable housing
• Concern: noise in rural areas
• Allow urban infill to continue protecting open space out of town
• Idea: Skate park in Forestville
• Open space accessible by foot or bike
• Regional trails connecting open spaces
• Guidelines for developers
• $$ towards access – Rec tours
• Plan long-range – % of county goal
• Children – education and access in underserved areas
• Community separators – enhanced quality of life and quality of community – Windsor – Healdsburg
• Renewal of urban limit lands
• Coast may not have same kind of threat as in other areas of county
• Old-growth redwoods – remnant 2nd growth very different type of habitat
• Community identity in the separators
• Education
• Wildlife corridors
• Concern about Windsor growth
• Separation of Healdsburg & Windsor
• Bodega Hwy outside of Bodega
• Salmon Creek area
• Ag properties (rangeland)

Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.
• Increased access to existing protected lands
• Saddle Mountain (permit program)
• Carrington
• Santa Rosa/Rohnert Park separator – types of cover, trees, etc.
• Redwood growth & enhancement
• Expansion of Foothill Regional Park
• Tierra example – highlight as it’s visible to the community
• Small farms in separators!
• Ag presence – Keep ag community involved
• Outreach to particular landowners
• Lake Sonoma Watershed
• Waterways, Dray Creek, protect, ease burdens on landowners
• Outreach – parcelization
• Threats to watersheds, groundwater, drinking, ag & res
• Ease burdens on taxpayers on unusable parcels, i.e., Dry Creek Restoration project
• Habitat connectivity/increase underpasses
• Farmers need dexterity and flexibility to manage property – harder to farm. Restrictions more $$.  
• Replants exempt from further restrictions
• Open/access to more land. Can regulate.
• Who to transfer land to?
• More access to land/trail system – create more connections
• Keep it up – keep tax.
• Be more intentional re acquisition targets – be proactive
• Dry Creek Valley – lots of ACC – find them and go after, especially outside of GB and community separators
• Analysis of conservation efforts as they relate to home prices
• Tell story of how density can protect landscapes
• Ag property w/o development potential still has ag conservation value.
• Look into valuation options
• Ag easement restrictions to protect wildlife and habitat
• Concerned about wildlife damage control
• Trails must be planned to avoid wildlife disruption -- can be species specific.
• Ag preservation – limit residential development
• Listed streams and watersheds focus on critical water conservation – Affirmative H2O
• Even fee acquisition for recharge or reservoirs
• Improving watershed health will put regulation in the back of issue.
• Resiliency to climate change
• Carbon sequestration – trees/restoration
• Incentives for best land management
• Long-range land management and conservation planning
• Ag easements can encourage innovation in resource preservation – learn from landowners and managers.
• More outreach for rec trail connections
• Make sure willing landowners are supportive of conservation intent – walk away from project if landowner pushes for too much allowance relative to District intent.
• How much do we know about wildlife corridors?
• How do we balance wildlife corridors and agricultural lands? Are agricultural lands an impediment to wildlife corridors?

*Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.*
• How do we utilize conservation easements to negotiate the terms to protect broad conservation goals; ag lands and wildlife simultaneously?
• Identify and clarify programs that work to protect and monitor wildlife
• How does the District prioritize management of invasive species on fee lands and easements? Concerned about pampas grass, scotch broom, ludwigia
• Watershed protection should be a high priority: connectivity of uplands to lower marshlands
• Is the District involved in protecting river access?
• Protection of watersheds is intact and in balance with public access
• Continued expansion of vineyards, mono-crops is a concern:
• Vineyard encroachment in sensitive areas
• Waterway setbacks
• Water usage for frost protection
• Channelization of rivers, creeks
• Riparian easements used to protect and restore natural meanders, flood protection
• More public outings, public-led hikes: Making the connection to where taxpayer dollars are going
• More access to coastal areas near Coleman Valley Road/adjacent
• Utilizing more signage to denote/advertise protected spaces
• Make conservation easements more “bulletproof”, harder to overturn
• Increase capacity to monitor District-protected lands
• Support agricultural-grazing practices that better sustain rangeland. Concerns: Compaction, overgrazing, watershed value.
• Quantify conservation values in relation to development pressure

INTERESTS

• Education of how to be an open space participant
• Should require Ag lands to be organic
  Continuity of work – forever!
• Community separators – surround each city with greenbelt
• Ag lands near cities
• Review & refresh greenbelt priorities
• Concern about restrictions on timber harvesting
• Likes diversity of lands
• Value community separators (concern over loss of separators)
• Protect stem of R.R. needs to find ways for flood protection, especially Middle Reach Wohler to Healdsburg
• Maybe landowners could be compensated for protecting riparian corridors along R.R.
• Concern about profitability of agriculture
• Habitat and watershed connectivity – wider corridors
• Open space/ecodiversity
• Stemming tide of vineyards
• Groundwater protection
• Friends of Atascadero Wetlands
• Recognize importance of wetlands in SoCo
• Natural resource protection
• Not as interested in public access

Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.
• Pitkin Marsh
• Endangered plants not protected
• Diverse ag, small farm, local foods, beauty
• Balance of lands we have
• Balance of lands that support lands
• Hiking, biking
• Ag and environment
• Coast
• People and natural resources
• Water quality
• So. Envir. Education Collaborative – reach out to other organizations – this presentation – advertise next meetings
• Add contiguous land for parks
• Add contiguous land for wildlife habitat
• Providing space for waterways to expand as more water comes in (e.g., rainy winters) and for flood protection
• Explore whether species are back after drought – vernal pools, special habitats
• Agricultural land
• Two Rock Valley & southwest county
• Forest, especially redwoods
• Entrance to county from Marin
• Greenbelts in south county – golf courses don’t count
• Connect Lafferty and Jack London State Park
• Areas for groundwater recharge
• Multiple benefits – ag + recharge + trails
• Riparian corridors – multiple benefits
• Denman Flats
• Petaluma River watershed
• River to 101 south
• Denman Flats to west (Pepper)
• East of 101 (Friedmans and north)
• Willowbrook and Lichau – streams and habitat
• KOA (“headwaters” of Petaluma River)

STRATEGIES / SOLUTIONS

• Encourage diverse ag
• Affirmative food production
• Open up ag easements to young farmers (leases)
• Strauss Milk
• Facilitate communication
• Curtailing suburban sprawl – protect separators
• Develop in urban centers – walkability to reduce pressure at edge
• Safer bike paths
• Infill development – before developing at edge
• Partnerships – neighborhood groups together with public & private orgs
• Second downtown on east side of Petaluma

Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.
• Build on existing parks and protected lands
• Reduce fees for parking at parks
• Having a buffer for climate change around coast
• Connectivity along coast – i.e., coastal trail
• Protecting ridgelines & views
• Can own but not build beyond X point
• Example: Marin County
• Should county adopt policy to protect ridgelines?
• Ag & Open Space Involvement in GP updates  Open Space and Land Use Elements
• Understanding ag & open space’s role and participation
• Language – the right language – [ag & open space] advocating for this (or working with partners to do so)
• Coordinating in cross-county and regional opportunities
• More parking at parks
• More uses at parks – especially mountain bikes
• Outreach in Spanish
• Urban & separators nears Rohnert Park and Petaluma
• Lands that provide multi-benefits – Geo lands and proximity to how people use those lands
• Focus on animals, plants and birds in prime areas for breeding, etc. Conservation for species.
• Park turned over are not well maintained
• Floods, etc. – trail maintenance
• Urban open spaces
• Trail system around a town – hiking/riding to offer public a bridge to natural world
• Urban separators and ability for families to use land for agriculture. Land prices are so high for ag.
• Opportunities for students – research and participation
• Greenbelt spaces
• Preserve D Street land adjacent to Helen Putnam – Davidon parcel.
• Protect ranch lands – maintain program to support descendants and current ranch owners
• In UK, system of public footpaths that are preserved in perpetuity – trail system. Connection of trails.
• Education of helping people to respect open space and wildlife
• Easements for narrow strips of land to connect areas of use
• Utilizing youth/education
• More specific about use of rec areas – e.g., mountain biking/pets
• Hut-to-hut vision
• Create a sense of “buy-in” with the public so they feel an ownership
• Limited access such as LandPaths does
• A manageable conservation plan before the land is transferred
• Rangers/authority figure
• Cross-county work – making sure to work with other organizations with same goals
• Community outreach
• Informing public before misinformation
• Educating
• Getting message out and building support
• Working with partners and building a bigger tent to do work
• Law
• Education
• Health

Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.
• Arts
• Tourism
• Small properties -- connect to be able to qualify for easement
• Wildlife overpasses, particularly east/west
• Focus on longer distance trails
• Protection on slopes & hillsides
• Higher density in city
• Enforcement of city ordinance on restricted development
• Watershed protection – salmon protection
• Green Valley & Dry Creek
• Salmon spawning areas
• Manage streams
• Mountain lion population increasing
• Proponent of easements over private land (Bxx for $$)
• Keeping lands in ag production and on tax rolls
• Land continues to fuel economy
• Some rec agencies approach ag leasing differently – state parks, no ag; regional parks, may keep ag
• Protection of natural resources
• Wild lands threats – tourism and wine industry (conversion of wildlands)
• Grazing is more compatible with natural resources
• Green Valley Cr. – long-term investments in natural resources
• Ag buyer – fast-track process so ag buyer can compete with estate home buyer.
• Maybe work with ag buyer who is already in contract
• Wetlands properties, even when small and isolated, have high conservation value.
• Recreation – multi-use bicycle
• Focus on connecting properties
• More trails
• Rec on private land – easements for rec
• Urban access
• Educating youth about rec conservation
• Food security – diversified
• Education about local ag
• District lacking ag specialist with ag background and range specialist
• Multi-benefit – conservation focus is not necessarily exclusive.
• Public access is important on privately conserved lands.
• Ag easement does not guarantee ag use – Affirmative Covenant
• Urban edge/Ag projects – Affirmative
• Transportation-centered growth and connections to open space
• Integrated public transit
• Public education about groundwater use/overuse – District help prevent overuse
• Promote dry farming
• Not just the land, but the groundwater beneath it
• District have conversations w/ winegrower groups about groundwater solutions, wildlife corridors
• Make assistance w/ natural resource issues (e.g., responsible water-use practices) part of CEs
• Share info about groundwater (e.g., where aquifers are located) w/ community as new data becomes available

Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.
LANDS TO PROTECT – GENERAL

- Properties for educational opportunities
- Both large & small parcels
- Funds for programs on these properties
- City of Sonoma owns hillsides with Sonoma Overlook Trail (admin. By Sonoma Ecology Ctr)
- Opportunity for connection
- CE needed
- Sonoma Development Center not in county parks system -- + natural resources, greenbelt – multi-benefits. Time & many partnerships.
- Access to areas safe to hike solo; not too remote; within cell phone service
- Keep some properties without dog access if appropriate
- Push to create high-density infill/sprawl
- More (controlled) mountain bike access (impacts currently concentrated at Annadel)
- Lake Fern – link between lakes on SDC
- Lose character
- Protect dark skies; hilltops
- Champlain Ranch across from rail station – Petaluma
- Gateway between Sonoma & Petaluma
- Industrial development in area
- Donnell (held by 3 children)
- Backdrop to Sonoma Valley from south
- Eastern ridge – ridgetops
- South/southeast ridge ends at Old Cherry Ridge
- Westerbeke – Should be District fee property
- Van Hoosear wildlife preserve
- Greenway a priority along SMART line
- Wetlands along edge of bay
- Sea level rise and flood protection
- Protection and restoration
- Northwest corner of county (e.g., plantation) – deter intensification of use
- Mountaintops, waterways, protecting diversity
- SDC property – groundwater recharge opportunity and wildlife corridor, great riparian habitat that is especially important to protect
- Wild areas
- Study overlooked habitats (e.g., chaparral)
- Maintaining different habitat types
- Escaped exotic plants (e.g., bamboo in Sonoma Creek, Arundo donax, blackberry)
- Hilltops, especially Sonoma Mountain – very visible from the valley
- Existing wetlands and restorable wetlands, vernal pools
- Opportunities for hiking with dogs (responsible, on-leash)
- Land above Boyes Hot Springs between Agua Caliente Rd & Siesta Way
- Large, undeveloped parcels being developed

Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.
• Can't currently walk to wild land from Boyes Hot Springs
• Prime valley oak lands in cities
• Small patches but are important habitat. Can we find a way to protect them?
• Vineyards encroach on valley oaks.
• Floodplain of Sonoma Creek (Leveroni area and others nearby, and between city and Hwy 121)
• Riparian easements – new opportunities for protection?
• Flood easements – pay ag landowners to flood properties and replenish groundwater
• Buy development potential (create an easement) in existing community separators
• Corner of Leveroni and 5th Street West and Napa Road and 8th Street East
• 8th Street East – neighbor of Sonoma Garden Park
• Hanna Boys Center lands
• Land near Dunbar School
• Julie & Tom Atwood property between Dunbar Rd and Hwy 12
• Natural landscapes to restore native habitats (e.g., streams, reintroduction of wolves in Yellowstone)
• Water sources – all tributaries to Russian River; headwaters for fish, recharge and human water
• Flood plains – esp Laguna de Santa Rosa [?]  
• Groundwater basins for recharge
• Areas for flood storage
• Parcel J in Santa Rosa (Paulin Creek)
• Areas close to and between urban areas (providing access to these areas)
• Acquisition of land within cities for multiple purposes – e.g., Greenway in SR
• Land within cities that provide open space for wildlife, too
• Land for endangered species, CTS, meadowfoam – without public access
• Transfer to Regional Parks rather than to State Parks because of management – lack of staff, funds, local control, intensive use of Annadel
• Identify partners that are sustainable
• Use funds to help Regional Parks O&M parks to maintain quality
• Protect open space lands not open to the public yet – for more eyes on the land; don’t close off to the public
• Grasslands as habitat for threatened species
• Protect wildlife on CE lands from potentially incompatible uses. Survey for spp.
• Lands vulnerable to vineyard development near other protected lands so as to maintain connectivity
• Protect land from fire hazard especially at urban edge/neighbors
• Connectivity for non-vehicular traffic; finish trail connections
• Animal corridors
• Ag
• Farms
• All, vineyards
• Sonoma Overlook Trail by easement (City of Sonoma backdrop)
• Sonoma Development Center
• Wildlands
• Developed
• Greenbelt
• That SDC stays in public hands
• Make sure that it actually moves forward
• These types of projects (e.g., SDC) can take too long to complete

Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.
• Institutional memory – Institutional memory can be lost when projects take a long time - from change in staff, changes in elected officials, etc.
• Connectivity
• Between protected lands, trails
• For people and wildlife
• Prioritizing trails (for people & wildlife)
• Bay Trail, Ridge Trail, Vine Trail (Napa)
• Opportunities to protect lands that are now becoming available – seizing these opportunities
• Hood Mtn & Sugar Loaf
• Annadel & Jack London
• Protecting scenic viewsheds around Santa Rosa, including mountains around SR
• Coastal lands, including ag
• Wetland protection + biodiversity
• Coastal protection
• Connectivity of trails
• Multi-use access
• District should promote ag preservation and the ecosystem services it provides
• Preserving beauty of coast
• Diverse ecosystems
• Focus on working lands that provide ecosystem services and promote this value to the general public (e.g., carbon sequestration)
• Wetlands, preservation of headwaters to our streams
• People making regulations don’t understand ag
• Need for adequate food production
• Young-Armos property – incubator farm is an important opportunity
• Public doesn’t understand farming – pay more attention to what farmers are saying and what they need
• Need closer conversation between SCAPOSD and farmers to learn how we can help each other and work together.
• Use forums/meetings to learn what ag can offer
• Adjacent lands
• Education programs to teach kids the importance of ag
• Term “preservation” vs “conservation”
• Need to manage resources, not lock them up
• Management through logging
• Rangelands and forestlands – working landscapes
• Coastal prairies
• Riparian areas
• Oak woodland habitats
• Vernal pools
• Restrict sale of invasive species at plant nurseries, eradicate from lands
• Ridgetops
• Methods to protect lands other than development rights – e.g., payment for ecosystem services
• Wants to see more reservoirs (water collection). Private reservoirs (ponds, etc.). Resources for landowners.
• Vital waters – more efforts by District staff to provide landowner resources
• Keep the soul in Sonoma County
• Needs robust technical resource database (e.g., agencies responsible)
• Appreciates network for farmers that supports small farms

Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.
• Rainwater catchment good!
• Broad diversity is the most important land to protect.
• Likes stacking functions on open space lands (e.g., composting operations).
• Maximizing use of land through multiple functions
• The District is “silied” – does it interact/communicate with other partner agencies?
• Re Vital Lands Initiative – What is vitality of the land?
• Shared vision in Sonoma County among agencies/areas (roads, water, etc.)
• District should take on leadership role
• Water scarcity is a very important issue
• Encourages District to have a more robust intern program to educate youth
• Connect communities to open space, walk or bike to parks from cities
• Riparian corridors to watershed complex
• Build systems of protection – landscape-scale protection
• Opportunities to widen floodplains – groundwater recharge
• Working in upper watershed
• Access to local food
• Diverse – coastal, inland, mountains, forest
• Community separators
• Whatever can get
• Viewsheds – Ridges & mountains, slopes
• Dairy belt
• Priorities for scenic
  o Diversity – River, redwoods, rolling hills
  o Ridgetops in Alexander Valley – Dry Creek
  o Wildlife corridors, Riddell property
  o Multi-benefit projects, connected network
  o Matching Grant touching residents
  o Ways for landowners to cooperate to get larger easements, especially along riparian corridors or for trails
  o Education of living in rural setting
• Trenton Road near Mirabel floodplain – this area needs protection
• End of Mill Station Road – Atascadero wetlands there are important to protect for the future
• Base of Black Mountain (where there are signs of cannabis grow) – important natural-resource area, also a fire-safety issue
• Of importance: public access, Laguna de Santa Rosa wetlands including restoration of them; also Ragle Park wetlands
• Scenic points, hiking access, cycling, public access for recreation
• Multiple access points (e.g., Willow Creek addition can be accessed from multiple points)
• Grove of Old Trees – there’s a group trying to protect this area by acquiring adjacent properties. Herndron Ranch, a 419-acre property connecting to Willow Creek, was cited.
• Riparian areas – wildlife needs natural, undeveloped area
• Ag and vineyard buffers – increase the size of existing ones
• Maintain distinct, small communities (small-town character/heritage)
• Project large areas for connectivity
• Concern: Use of water for agriculture – e.g., vineyards and their use of water – any special permits they have to use water for irrigation
• Threat: Cannabis grows on large tracts of land where there’s no monitoring
• Development issues – Use of State, Federal and local laws to contain overdevelopment

Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.
• Threat: fire – too much undergrowth, need for controlled burns, better stewardship, more funding for protection, improved management such as use of livestock to help manage vegetation
• Forever Forestville – example of a community-based project (funding sources for these)
• Wild spaces
• Green spaces – paths/trails to access them easily (e.g., Atascadero wetlands)
• Multi-use recreational areas
• Redwoods – protect both large and small tracts
• Uniqueness of redwoods (Northern CA and Oregon) and their value (carbon capture, wildlife habitat, etc.)
• Coastal – try to protect large areas that connect to existing protected lands
• The Cedars as a potential acquisition (question of BLM lands – Fed vs. local control/management)
• San Pablo Bay area
• Community separators – are they forever?
• Allocation of funds for land management
• Mountain bike access near Forestville (El Molino HS)
• Ridge and riparian trails connections between parks
• OK with minimal development on rec properties
• Wohler Br. To Healdsburg Br. To Steelhead Beach Trail (coordinate with Water Agency) Russian River access/trail
• Maintain & protect from damage and impacts, insure safety
• Partnership with private mitigation
• Lands for access
• Laguna access
• Diversity is important
• Vernal pools
• Properties that encompass multiple ecosystems
• Oak Park (Baird and Badger Road). The EIR glossed over existence of vernal pools property for sales 14 acres.
• Development pressure and zoning
• Ag lands under threat. Endangered Species Act. Under threat from new regulations.
• Invasive species outcompeting native species
• Protect undisturbed lands
• Balancing grazing with invasive species
• Greenbelt separators (Santa Rosa to Rohnert Park). Concern about encroachment into greenbelts.
• Economic pressures on land use (housing, cannabis zoning)
• Climate change
• Ground water recharge areas
• Lack of adequate flood protection
• Tax payers’ perception of access to land (make clear intention of the use of the land. If no public access, explain why.)
• District should make public aware of the purpose of various properties
• Embrace concept of fire defense zones
• How can County do a better job of making sure easements are in place and enforced
• Important de facto parks (Fitch Mountain, Paulin Creek, etc.)
• Public is unaware of status of parks/public access on District/County/City properties
• Important inter-agency communication
• Wildlife corridors
• Damage from livestock – grazing must be managed properly
• Rare and endangered plants and animals; problem with wild boars
• Education important

Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.
• Decommission erosive fire roads
• Likes creek signage advertising importance of watersheds
• Rails to Trails network important
• Connecting greenbelts for bicycling
• Southeast Greenway future development
• Trails around perimeter of ag lands off road along fence lines
• More places where dogs are allowed
• Coastal trail
• Connect Salt Point and S. Water Cove
• West County Trail to Steelhead Beach
• Forestville to S.R. and Coast Trail
• Trails along roads but separated
• Proper design of trails
• Historical significance
• Ocean sanctuaries
• Balance between protection and accessibility
• Protect at-risk ag lands – true ag lands
• Props that could be developed/remain protected agriculture
• Also important to protect: Predators, salmon, redwoods, migratory birds
• Oak pastureland west of Fulton Rd
• Areas that contain vernal pools
• Area off of Llano Road
• Oak woodlands near urban area
• Ag other than vineyards (e.g., loss of apple orchards)
• Property adjacent to Hood Mountain along Pythian Rd and former juvenile center
• Wildlife corridors
• “Common” wildlife so that it doesn’t start to become rare
• Groundwater recharge, wetlands
• Safe connections between parks (e.g., Forestville Park and Youth Park)
• Safe bike lanes/routes
• Regional travel trails between communities
• Bus tours between wineries
• Opportunities for tourism industry to help support open space
• Tourists, residents, and local businesses could “adopt” a trail
• Steward and protect land
• Program like this in Laguna, Russian River
• Events like closing a road 1 day/year to cars to allow safe biking/walking around county and between open spaces
• Educate visitors about protecting lands in Sonoma County
• Historical lands (e.g., Carrillo Adobe)
• Protect natural beauty, habitat, native plants, biodiversity
• Connect open spaces (between parks, for bike riding and variety of activities)
• Multi-use trails – equestrian
• Diverse landscape
• Multiple benefits on each project
• Visual landscapes
• Bay Area Ridge Trail – fill in the gaps, create connections

Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.
• Wildlife corridors
• Undeveloped ‘flat’ land for food and groundwater
• Coast – scenic, rec use
• Outreach to general public
• Intact native habitat – valley oaks, remnant populations, smaller areas

**LANDS TO PROTECT – SPECIFIC**

• Trail connectivity (e.g., between Healdsburg Ridge to Fitch Mtn)
• The Cedars near Russian River
• Petaluma – Davidon parcel
• Sonoma Mountain – west and south sides
• Between Helen Putnam and Terra Firma – easements?
• Connect T.F. to Mt. Burdell
• Saddle Mountain without access
• Galvin Ranch
• Needs to be protected
• Willing landowners
• On Sonoma Mountain
• Andronico Vallejo in Sonoma
• Carriger Estate in Sonoma -- historical resource
• Lafferty Ranch
• Coastal access
• Well-loved properties/places: Glenn Oaks, Montini, SDC, Sonoma Valley Reg Park, Tolay, Laguna, North Coast/Redwoods, Bartholomew Park (Castle Park)
• Bike trail along coast
• More bike trails
• Work with adjacent counties
• Sonoma Mountain – visible from East Washington/town (Lafferty)
• Connectivity between communities & open space for people
• Wildlife corridors
• Forest lands – studies showing sick forest contribute to greenhouse gases
• Sonoma Mountain – view of mountain from town and of town from mountain (access)
• Public access (esp. Lafferty)
• Landscapes
• Davidon Scott Ranch – add to Helen Putnam Park or other public space for access
• Headwaters (Adobe Creek) to Kelly Creek
• Access to wildlands/geographic diversity + rare & generally
• Hoping to connect Oak Park, Rincon Valley. May have endangered plants on property.
• Focus on parks
• Focus on ag preservation
• Concern about greenbelts. Would love to see interconnected greenbelts.
• Appreciate outdoor activity (mountain biking, etc.)
• Problem with pastures being parks
• Diversity of landscape appreciation. Important to maintain diversity.

*Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.*
• Likes Prince Memorial Greenway – can ride all the way to Sebastopol. Connectivity among properties.
• Rides mountain bikes in Annadel. Wants to see a mountain bike trail all the way to Calistoga.
• Mountain bike advocate. Easy access to open space from home. Connectivity among properties.
• Paulin Creek Preserve – concerned about future development

THREATS

• Subdivision
• Pavement
• Potential to make money through development
• Death of current landowners
• “Carpet bagging” -- $$ coming in from other counties
• Pension worries – supervisors are afraid of maxing out budget
• Tourism, vacation rentals
• Need to find a balance
• Promote our natural resources as well as our wine
• Population – people who live here and people who visit is too much
• Tourism industry not sustainable – low-paying local jobs
• Not enough public transportation; biking is unsafe
• Growth of brewing industry – water intensive
• Cannabis – deforestation
• Losing our sense of place, sense of community
• Convenience is a threat
• Protection of ag lands
• Difficulty protecting land in high-elevation areas (especially highly visible)
• Conflict with vineyards, resources, wildlife
• Pot – community conversation to find solution
• Ag area lands to protect
• Pastureland that provides views vs. vineyards and pot
• Possibly limiting ag where conflicting issues are – e.g., viewsheds, etc. (desire for ag & open space to prioritize natural resources, scenic, etc over ag when in conflict)
• Acquisition of trail easements, not just whole property, to save $$
• Conflict between recreation and wildlife
• Development – housing sprawl
• Funding
• Need to protect watershed as a whole – be proactive
• Groundwater recharge, wetland
• Less rainfall, longer droughts
• Sprawl
• Population growth – high or low density – water
• Too many conflicting land uses:
• Growth
• Vineyards
• Cannabis
• Drought – this is a semi-arid climate

Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.
• Lack of maintenance/management of properties
• Fire – e.g., thinning needed
• Risk management is important
• Lack of support for reauthorization
• Opportunity and conflict with multiple land-conservation organizations
• Relationship between Sonoma Land Trust and District
• Community does not know the difference between the organizations
• Opportunity for communication – e.g., Tolay Lake: What was District’s involvement? It’s not clear to public.
• Coordination between SLT and District to identify perceived threat and lack of communication – e.g., Jenner Headlands: SLT as lead because of funding opportunities
• County policies re land use
• Also, cities – e.g., land-use zoning. Their plan might be bad.
• Needing home for District fee properties – what if other agency/entity cannot take fee properties?
• Concern about maintenance: quality of, cutting maintenance costs, ignoring pr [??]
• Concern for Regional Parks and ability to care for properties
• Entity holding transfer property needs resources to take care of it
• Stewardship and monitoring rate not keeping up with acquisition
• Ability to fund stewardship as potential threat
• Reserve fund is finite
• Coordination with neighboring counties (e.g., Napa, Marin)
• Potential conflicts
• Communication
• Regional and ecosystems that don’t conform to political boundaries
• Question about future of District – merge with Regional Parks?
• Reg Parks and need for funds
• Need to be able to support all properties we protect forever
• How to ensure perpetuity with regards to stewardship and enforcement?
• Bike and other trail connectivity is important – walk/bike from Sonoma Valley to ocean
• Water – SGMA & coordination with SCWA
• Groundwater basin doesn’t capture watershed in SGMA designation
• Protect watershed to the ridges rather than catchment basin
• Coordination with other agencies needed
• Facts to support efforts needed
• Stricter easement language needed
• Erosion and overuse of trails – need access and people presence to deter undesirable activity
• Balance the need for housing
• Communicate connection of open space and quality of life, and connection of open space to their daily lives
• Echo the need to educate folks on what the District can do vs. other entities
• Lack of succession planning
• Speed of development – put infrastructure in place first, no leapfrogging
• City budget
• Type & affordability of residential development
• Cost of housing
• Not enough housing threatens partnerships for conservation
• City General Plan’s approach to development
• County budget & G.P.

Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.
• Expanding city limits
• Transit (moving people)
• Hwy 101 expansion
• Urban centers that are walkable/livable
• Areas along Hwy 101 are getting “trashed” (garbage, poor development)
• Focus on beauty as a value
• Green buffers (capturing CO2), sound proofing – good!
• Vineyards – too many. Detrimental to landscape, taking water resources.
• Crop monoculture
• Climate change
• Pot grows
• People – teach respect and practice
• Public access where sensitive resources could be impacted
• Vineyard and housing push
• Divisive political climate – not listening
• No support for continued sales tax
• Cost for people to access parks
• Climate change – unknown future
• Lack of younger generation in this process – go to where users are, e.g., parks & classrooms. District should go to classrooms directly to get kids involved in outdoors.
• Need accurate data about what community wants
• Need to continue outreach and education (e.g., LandPaths)
• Housing & profit motives
• Cannabis
• Regulations that make agriculture difficult or unprofitable
• Conflicting programs
• Logging restrictions
• Not being allowed to do prescriptive burning
• Wetlands should not be open for public access
• Can still provide education, but shouldn’t have hiking
• Passive appreciation
• Docent-led access could be an option
• Climate change
• Regulations
• Inadequate management
• Ranching next to Forever Wild areas allows coyotes to eat livestock
• Cannabis
• Cannabis grows
• Lafferty – city-owned with H2O threatened for development
• Captured/sequestration by wealthy
• Forests – fuel management
• Conifers and hardwoods
• Carbon sequestration
• Public access = protection (maybe fewer cannabis grows with more people on land)
• Land with H2O + threat of development should be priority for protection
• Local food production

Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.
• Public access on agricultural lands that are protected (encourage + incentive) – e.g., England
• McNear peninsula remainder
• Incubator farms – encouraging row crops – priority food rather than grapes/wine
• Scenic corridors + urban boundaries (Dutra)
• Floodplain – north of Washington (Corona Reach)
• Also wildlife corridor
• Some public access to keep natural or pervious
• La Cresta Ridge & ravine (Matching Grant Program)
• Adjacent to protected/public land
• Views
• Marin – Sonoma County
• Gateway/entry to Sonoma County
• Lafferty – permanent protection
• Work with City (Matching Grant Program or conservation easement) – traditional acquisition or leverage funding
• Coordination with other public entities (See: Marin County, Spring Lake/Howarth Park/Annadel)
• Ag and Open Space educating public on open space lands & how we work, what lands are, and how we pay for it
• Highlight protected lands to public
• Signage on protected lands
• Balancing land protection with housing affordability – partner with Greenbelt Alliance and others
• Protection of salmonid streams (Adobe & Petaluma River)
• Access to Petaluma River for public? Could be improved
• Scott Ranch/Davidon
• There are red-legged frogs that should be protected
• 100+ trees would be cut down with development
• Sonoma Mountain top properties in south county – Lafferty and others, also connections to Jack London and other parks
• District priority should be ag first – District has not been prioritizing ag. Lack of affirmative ag requirements
• Developments
• Vineyard development
• Climate change
• Piecemeal lands
• Cannabis
• Loss of groundwater resources
• Prioritizing conservation easements based on groundwater basins
• Big retail
• Dogs off leash, waste, enforcement
• Generational change in owners
• High land prices
• Climate change
• Lack of public transit
• Urban sprawl
• Climate change and its effects on water resources
• Pollution from agriculture in river
• Climate change – birds not migrating
• Residents needing education on conservation

Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.
• Signage! Signs showing protected by District. This is good PR for the District and good for people to know where their tax dollars are being spent.
• Dogs off leash in preserves
• Commercialism of property to raise funds to keep and maintain property
• Change from original reason for protection
• Public access impacts – need education and limit types of access
• Ambient light and noise levels
• Pot – will take us away from traditional wine and comfort zone. Stay on top of it.
• Tourism & events – countywide more restrictive some necessary
• Roads – quality
• Developments starting up again
• Permanent UGBs countywide – good, not threat
• Humans!
• Continued pressure for development for housing and agriculture
• Need crop diversity
• Keep housing off best farmland
• Live in town and commute to farm like in Europe
• Need more ag presence than on open space (where focus has been)
• Tourism overload – events
• Tourists move here
• Nimbyism
• Access on ag lands
• On mountain ranges, disruption of wildlife corridors, development
• High biodiversity/ecosystems (threats to)
• Lack of affordable housing
• Greenbelts around and within cities – natural type
• Misinformation about open space assets
• Changing ag economy – non-vineyard, future planning and support
• To riparian areas – widen
• Need to demonstrate benefits – carbon, ag, access, eco-tourism
• More public speaking to groups
• Anticipate change in ag use
• Impacts of climate change
• Incentivize private landowners to agree to public use, multi-uses
• Invasive species, management on CEs
• Include all users
• Getting public agencies to cooperate on access
• Overuse by people
• Misuse by people
• Lack of education on proper use
• Not enough administration, personnel, time on site, enforcement, education
• Pesticides (Roundup) and the role of SCAPOSD
• Can the non-CE portion be protected?
• Affirmative CES – impact of CE on sales values – organic vs. not
• Monoculture
• Fencing – cutting off wildlife

Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.
• Ag H2O usage – unregulated (include watershed protection)
• Heavy water usage on certain crops
• Impact of Federal government – leveraging $$ -- opportunities decline; roll back of regulations
• Key access – access to public lands and CEs that address access; limiting ease of access, Atascadero wetlands
• Marijuana grows
• Wineries and event centers (“Dairyman”) – Hwy 12 – is this a community separator?
• Notice of CE (sign) by landowner – source of pride (e.g., “Farm Trails”)
• CEs are publicly available
• Disconnect of kids and land and ways to remediate it using outreach
• Ed groups are maxed out – need for more partnering groups
• Provide curriculum to teachers
• Outreach to potential sellers (being more proactive to all landowners)
• Realtors – new landowners
• Norbar (Realtors Association) – present at meetings
• Additional funding through tax measure
• LiDAR to ID potential land to pursue (Imwalle)
• Sprawl and subdivisions
• Vineyards – threats to water resources
• Large marijuana farms and associated industry, pollution
• Difficulty putting a value on natural resources

**OPPORTUNITIES**

• Use ag land to recharge groundwater, improve habitat, improve riparian areas
• Integrate local food production into projects
• Human connectivity to land – trails through ag properties – customers for ag production
• Greenbelts/Community Separators
• Rare Natural Communities listed by the NDDB and VegCamp
• Protection of threatened & endangered species
• Protection of oak woodlands
• Threat: Tribal lands and putting them in trust – e.g., on west side of Windsor
• Protection of vistas
• Riparian buffer
• Natural resources
• Protection of Sonoma Mountain (Ellis Creek area)
• Threat: Cannabis and agricultural sprawl (emphasize sustainable ag)
• Emphasis on food crops
• Threat of development of retreat centers, event centers in rural areas (RRD zoning), eg of Sulfur Creek area. If development allowed, sets a precedent.
• Small-parcel sustainable, organic farming
• Coastal Act – preservation of coast
• Threat – tourism and its effects on roads (e.g., winery events, etc.)
• General sustainability issues
• Diversified ag, creation of an ag museum to share Sonoma County’s history for future generations
• Policies to promote diversity in ag, with an emphasis on locally produced products

*Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.*
CONSTRAINTS

- Carbon farming
- Community separators – Enlarge, aggressive acquisition
- Fitch Mountain
- Community health
- Access to farmable land, i.e., incubator farms
- Riparian protection and corridor compensation
- Explore options
- Hillside subject to erosion
- Existing forest – virgin priority

Note: These notes do not reflect the District’s priorities or any implicit or implied plan of action. These are only the transcriptions of input provided at public meetings.