

TO: PARK ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
FROM: RICH GUARIENTI, CHAIR  
SUBJECT: PARK ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**Date: July 27, 2009**  
**Location: East Bay Regional Park District  
2950 Peralta Oaks Court, Oakland**

6:45 p.m. Social (Refreshments & Relaxation – all members and guests)

**7:00 p.m. REGULAR MEETING**

1. Approval of Minutes – June 22, 2009
2. Introductions
3. Board Member Comments: Director Ayn Wieskamp
4. Public Comments
5. Presentations:
6. (R) a. Trails Change Checklist Tilden-Briones – Brian Wiese, Chief Planning/Stewardship/GIS & Raphael Breines, Park Planner *(20 minutes)*  
(R) b. Review of 2009 Revisions to Ordinance 38 – Lieutenant Jon King, Public Safety  
*(20 minutes)*
7. PAC Member Comments
8. Report from the Chair – Rich Guarienti
9. Board Committee Reports
10. Status of Recommendations
11. Old Business
12. New Business
13. Adjournment to September 28, 2009

(A) Action

(I) Information

(R) Recommendation

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Memo Trails Checklist
2. Memo Ordinance 38
3. Work Plan 2009
4. Status of Recommendations
5. Articles & Correspondence

**East Bay Regional Park District  
Public Safety Division**

**2009 Ordinance 38 Review**

Section	Requestor	Proposed Changes	Justification
200.3 (New)	Staff	<i><u>The General Manager may temporarily suspend or modify provisions of the Ordinance for public health or safety reasons. The General Manager shall notify the Board of Directors within 30 days of any actions taken pursuant to this section.</u></i>	This provides the authority for short term modifications without seeking approval by the Board. An example would be opening a trail for multi-use to provide access when the normal trail is blocked or damaged.
403.1	Police Department	This section would become a wobbler and could be charged as an infraction or misdemeanor.	Currently, this section is a misdemeanor and requires officers to write a report and have the case charged with the District Attorney. If it is charged as an infraction, no report is needed and it can be filed with the Traffic Court, saving time and resources.
409.8d	Operations Division	Bicycles are not permitted on narrow hiking or riding trails, except those areas specifically designated from time to time by the Board as allowed. Attachment "A" contains the current list of exceptions.  Attachment A <i><u>-Clyma Trail in Morgan Territory.</u></i> <i><u>-North Ridge Trail (between marker 34&amp;37 in Pleasanton Ridge.</u></i> <i><u>-Briones Crest Trail (north of Deer Creek Trail) in Briones</u></i> <i><u>-Brushy Peak Loop Trail in Brushy Peak</u></i> <i><u>-Hulet Hornbeck Trail in Carquinez Shoreline</u></i> <i><u>-Blue Oak Shortcut Trail in Briones</u></i> <i><u>-Crockett Hills North and South Trails in Crockett Hills</u></i>	Sections of single track trails have been opened for multi-use in some areas to complete critical trail linkages within parks. Many of these changes have already been approved by the Board through the LUP process. These changes update the ordinance to reflect current approved usage.
409.8k (New)	Police Department	<i><u>Bicycles on all Regional Trails shall be required to stop at stop signs posted prior to the trail's intersection with roadways, driveways and other crossings. If there is no limit line, the closest edge of the intersecting roadway or railroad crossing shall serve as the limit line.</u></i>	The vehicle code does not apply to Regional Trails. This will provide a legal means to enforce the currently posted stop signs.
410.1(g)	Police	<i><u>No person under the age of 21 years</u></i>	Currently, this is enforced via a

(New)	Department	<u>shall possess or consume any alcoholic beverage within any park or facility owned or operated by the East Bay Regional Park District.</u>  <u>410.1(h)</u> Violation of this section is an infraction.	misdemeanor Business and Professions Code section and requires officers to write a report and have the case charged with the District Attorney. If it is charged as an infraction, no report is needed and it can be filed with the Traffic Court, saving time and resources.
501.3	Aquatics Department	Restrictions. Private boat, kayaks, rubber rafts, personal water craft (jet skis) or other vessels of any description shall not be permitted on Chabot Reservoir (except that hand carried kayaks, canoes and sculls may be permitted at Lake Chabot), Lake Anza, Lake Temescal, Jewel Lake, don Castro, Cull Canyon, Garin (Jordan Pond), Hayward Shoreline ponds, Martinez Shoreline lagoon, Miller-Knox lagoon, Coyote Hills marsh water areas, Shadow Cliffs Arroyo Ponds ( <u>float tubes allowed</u> ), <u>Quarry Lakes (Willow Slough and Lago Los Osos)</u> . <del>or</del> Motorized boats or jet skis <u>are not allowed</u> within any marked or posted sensitive marsh or wildlife area.	Boats are not currently allowed in areas at Quarry Lakes and float tubes are allowed in some areas of Shadow Cliffs. These changes update the ordinance to reflect current approved usage and prohibitions.
801.1(f)	Operations Division	Attachment "B" is the current list of Parks or Areas of Parks where dogs are currently prohibited. Attachment "B" Wildlife Protection Areas – for Listed Species at Risk <u>Round Valley Regional Preserve</u>	This brings the District into compliance with the current US Fish and Wildlife/Fish & Game agreements prohibiting dogs in Round Valley due to the presence of the endangered Kit Fox.
801.3	Operations Division	<u>Leash Optional Areas (Undeveloped Areas)</u> . A dog may run at large under the control of its owner or handler within undeveloped areas of the District, provided, however, that the owner or handler shall have a leash <u>for each dog</u> in his/her possession and keep the dog under control at all times.	This requires dog owners and handlers to have a leash for each dog, making it easier to gain control of all dogs they have with them in conflict situations.
801.8(a)	Operations Division	Carry a leash <u>for each dog in his/her possession</u> .	Same as above for dogs at Point Isabel.

Note: Proposed additions to the ordinance are *listed in italics and underlined*. Proposed deletions from the ordinance are ~~struck out~~.

## ATTACHMENT A: TECHNICAL ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED CHANGES IN A TRAIL'S USES (CHECKLIST) REVISED JUNE 26, 2009

Trail Name: Alhambra Creek Staging Area Access Trail, Park Briones Regional Park, Location: Northeast Section of Park, Date Reviewed: October 15, 2008

Describe the existing condition of the trail, including user types, use patterns and natural resources: this trail is located in the northeast section of Briones Regional Park and runs adjacent to the road that leads to the Alhambra Creek Staging Area. The trail is almost two-thirds of a mile (3,406 feet) and is now open to hikers and equestrians. The request seeks to open this narrow trail to bicycle traffic.

Neither the trail nor staging area are a regional draw. There are relatively few houses in the immediate area and no large residential communities, so the trail is generally used by locals. This is a popular trail with hikers, dog-walkers and equestrians, as the Briones Horse Center is located at the end of the road and other stables are nearby. However, it is common for hikers and equestrians, as well as bicyclists, to access the staging area on the adjacent road, sometimes in groups. Trail use surveys conducted by the Volunteer Trail Safety Patrol have consistently identified hikers, equestrians (in groups) and dog walkers on this trail. For example, on a weekday in August 2008, between the hours of 9:30 a.m. and 1:30 p.m., 14 pedestrians, 3 equestrians and 10 dogs were observed on the trail. In addition, bicycles and a jeep were recently seen on this trail illegally. The trail is most busy on weekends and weekdays in the late afternoon after work hours. There are no records of accidents or emergencies on this trail over the past five years, but the Public Safety and Operations Departments are aware of conflicts in the area among user groups, particularly between dog walkers and horseback riders.

The trail is nearly level. Though the tread of the trail is relatively narrow in places, at less than 24 inches, line of site and passing room are adequate along the length of the trail. The trail is located between Alhambra Creek and the staging area entry road. The trail generally runs right next to or nearby the entry road and in one area the trail ends for a short segment and trail users are forced onto the road at this 'pinch point,' as there is no room between the creek and road. The trail is located on a former farm field and bisects open grassland and oak-bay woodland. The trail is located within federally-designated critical habitat for Alameda whipsnake. However, the closest recorded Alameda whipsnake sighting is more than 4,000 feet away across a major road, and the habitat that bisects the trail does not provide primary constituent elements (or key habitat features) essential for the conservation of whipsnake. In addition, the trail and its immediate surroundings are not part of and do not link contiguous blocks of occupied whipsnake habitat. Therefore, use change adds no further significant potential to harm Alameda whipsnake.

Describe the proposed trail use change, including its general benefits and the physical changes to the existing trail needed to accommodate the proposed new use: The trail use change seeks to allow bicyclists as an additional user group on this narrow park entry trail, now designated for hiking and equestrian use. The adjacent entry road, which is owned and maintained by the Park District, is a narrow two-lane road with several curves and is shared by automobiles, pedestrians, equestrians and cyclists, and can get crowded with multiple user groups. The East Bay Area Trails Council submitted this use change request to improve the safety of bicyclists and motorists by allowing cyclists use of the adjacent trail and to permit cyclists to conveniently enter the park, like other user groups, off-road on a level trail. Use change could reduce user conflict on the park entry road (by removing bicyclists from having to ride on the road). However, this change could also result in transferring existing user conflict to the trail. Outside of the park, a separated paved trail parallels Reliez Valley Road to the east. Currently, bicyclists can enter the park via the entry road itself or on a multi-use trail from Reliez Valley Road that connects to the Tavan Trail and the staging area, but this trail is steep, strenuous to traverse and a less direct route to the staging area than the trail being evaluated.

No new trail would need to be developed to implement this use change request. Proposed improvements to accommodate the request would include clearing of site lines from brush, limb or weed encroachment; replacing a short stretch of barbed wire with smooth wire or another barrier; and installing appropriate signs both on the trail and roadway, specifically at the 'pinch point,' alerting all users of potential conflicts.

Name: Raphael Breines Position: Senior Park Planner, Unit: Planning & Stewardship, Phone: 510-544-2325, E-mail: rbreines@ebparks.org

District Staff will use this checklist: to: (1). Determine the feasibility and appropriateness of proposed changes in allowed uses for an existing trail. (2). Determine if Planning or CEQA is needed. (3). Determine the appropriateness of amendments to Ordinance #38 for regulating uses on an existing trail. The addition of new trails will be considered during the development of a park's Land Use/CEQA document and not through this checklist process.

Answer each question with a yes or no.	Yes	No	Describe positive and negative impacts of the proposed change related to this question, and any other details related to this question to be considered before a decision is made.
--	-----	----	--

**CIRCULATION**

1. Would the proposed change affect trail use circulation?		✓	Bicyclists already can use the road to access the Alhambra Creek Staging Area so use change would not change circulation
2. Would the proposed change provide a loop connection for an existing group of unauthorized trail users to a multi-use trail, or connection to an adjacent park?		✓	
3. Would the proposed change provide the only alternative for achieving a desirable trail connection for a specific user group?		✓	See #1 above
4. Would the proposed change allow trail access to areas that are not connected or to serve staging areas or other trail heads?		✓	
5. Would the proposed change improve circulation and/or relieve congestion on other high use trails?		✓	But use change could relieve congestion on the road into the Alhambra Creek Staging Area
6. Would the proposed change require a closure of the trail on either a temporary or permanent basis during wet season conditions?		✓	
7. Describe any other circulation impacts of proposed changes not covered above.			Use change would improve the safety of bicyclists by giving them the option of either riding on trail or the adjacent road. Moreover, use change would give cyclists the opportunity now available to other user groups to enter the park off-road on a flat and convenient trail

Answer each question with a yes or no.	Yes	No	Describe positive and negative impacts of the proposed change related to this question, and any other details related to this question to be considered before a decision is made.
<b>NATURAL RESOURCES AND VALUES</b>			
8. Would the proposed trail use change benefit natural resources near the trail or generally in the park?		✓	
9. Would the proposed change contribute to unacceptable breakdown of trail shoulders, or any form of irreparable trail damage?		✓	
10. Would the proposed change eliminate a use that is currently causing unacceptable breakdown of trail shoulders, or any form of irreparable trail damage?		✓	
11. Would the proposed change cause trail tread rutting, impairment of trail drainage, or cause significant erosion?		✓	
12. Would the proposed change eliminate a use that is currently causing trail tread rutting, impairment of trail drainage, or cause significant erosion?		✓	
13. Would the proposed change result in geological instability, landslides or other similar serious safety impacts?		✓	
14. Would the proposed change eliminate a use or need for maintenance that contributes to geological instability?		✓	
15. Would the proposed change introduce a new use that may impact or disturb sensitive listed native plants, animals, or their habitat?		✓	The location of the trail falls within federally-designated critical habitat for Alameda whipsnake. The closest recorded sighting of a whipsnake is 4,000 feet to the northeast across a major road. However, the trail is not located in an area known to be occupied by whipsnake and plant communities that bisect or link the trail do not provide high-value whipsnake habitat. Therefore, use change would not adversely impact Alameda whipsnake
16. Would the proposed change require construction or maintenance that would impact or disturb sensitive listed native plants, animals, or their habitat?		✓	Use change would involve routine trail improvements, which would not adversely affect sensitive or protected plants, animals or habitat
17. Would the proposed change require construction or maintenance that would impact or disturb sensitive archaeological or historic resources?		✓	The immediate area does not contain known archaeological resources
18. Would the proposed change trigger regulatory review or permit requirements with a requirement for mitigation?		✓	
19. Describe any other resource impacts or benefits of the proposed trail use change not covered above			

Answer each question with a yes or no.	Yes	No	Describe positive and negative impacts of the proposed change related to this question, and any other details related to this question to be considered before a decision is made.
<b>TRAIL USER SAFETY</b>			
20. Will a change in existing trail use require staff to make substantial changes in design and maintenance procedures for the trail regarding:			
a. Steepness		✓	The trail is nearly level
b. Outslopes		✓	
c. Visibility or line of sight		✓	Trimming brush, limbs and weeds, consistent with the Park District's general practice, would maintain line of site
d. Turn outs or Pull outs		✓	
e. Emergency response		✓	The trail is easily accessible to public safety vehicles
f. Police enforcement		✓	Conflicts now occur between user groups and use change should not increase conflicts nor result in the need for increased police presence or response
g. Exposing trail users to additional major road crossings		✓	This proposal seeks to give bicyclists the choice of either riding on the road or the trail. This would likely provide a safety benefit to both cyclists and motorists
21. Would the proposed change invite undesired off trail use adjacent to the trail?		✓	
<b>COMPATIBILITY OF USES</b>			
22. Would the proposed change in use be compatible with current trail width to allow multiple trail user groups to safely pass each other?	✓		In general, the trail has adequate site lines and passing room to accommodate multiple use. The proposal includes clearing vegetation and replacing an existing barbed wire fence with smooth wire or other barrier
23. Would the proposed changed use conflict with circulation at facilities such as a stable, interpretive facility, nature study area, other? If yes please describe potential conflicts		✓	There are horse stables nearby and this trail is popular with equestrians, but use change should not conflict with circulation at these facilities
24. Would the proposed changed use be located in a high use area that can't handle more use? (ie: limited staging, few trails, etc.)		✓	
25. Would the proposed changed use be in an area that already experiences documented trail user conflict?	✓		User conflicts occur among motorists, pedestrians, equestrians and bicyclists along the entry road. Use change could alleviate (or perhaps transfer) some of the existing conflicts by giving bicyclists the option of riding on the trail
26. Would the proposed changed use significantly affect the experience of existing trail users?		✓	Though use change could slightly alter the character of the trail through minor trail maintenance, the conditions for existing trail users should not be significantly affected because this trail can accommodate additional users and is located adjacent to the road, in an active area of the park
27. Describe any other compatibility issues related to the proposed change in trail use			

Answer each question with a yes or no.	Yes	No	Describe positive and negative impacts of the proposed change related to this question, and any other details related to this question to be considered before a decision is made.
<b>TRAIL MAINTENANCE</b>			
28. Would the proposed change require additional annual or ongoing brush clearing or vegetation management?	✓		To accommodate multiple use, the Park District would implement minor trail improvements, consisting primarily of vegetation management and other routine activities, to maintain trail width and site lines
29. Would the proposed change require additional drainage improvements or annual or ongoing drainage maintenance?		✓	Regardless of use change, sections of road/trail will eventually need to be improved because of poor drainage and erosion
30. Would the proposed change require additional and/or ongoing trail stabilization or trail surface maintenance?		✓	
31. Would the proposed change require additional retaining walls or structures be constructed and require ongoing maintenance?		✓	
32. Describe any changes in maintenance related to the proposed change not covered above			
<b>CONSTRUCTION</b>			
33. Describe any construction that would be required on the trail to accommodate the proposed trail use change			Barbed wire is located along a short section of trail, and prior to opening it to bicycles it should be removed and replaced with smooth gauge wire or removed and replaced with boulders or other barrier. Standard signs alerting park visitors of potential conflicts should be installed on the trail and road, which are owned and maintained by the Park District
34. Would the proposed change require an increase or reduction in funding for construction? If yes describe how much?		✓	
35. Would the proposed trail use change require that the District complete a construction project that is not on its current work list or plan?		✓	
36. Would the construction to accommodate the new proposed trail use be handled by someone other than the District? If yes please describe		✓	

Answer each question with a yes or no.	Yes	No	Describe positive and negative impacts of the proposed change related to this question, and any other details related to this question to be considered before a decision is made.
<b>PLANNING/CEQA</b>			
37. Would the proposed trail use change require additional land tenure, a new maintenance/operating agreement? If yes please describe.		✓	
38. Would the proposed trail use change occur in an area that has a history of litigation or create any unusual legal exposure for the District? If yes please describe.		✓	
39. Would CEQA review be required (as determined by CEQA Planner in Planning/Stewardship Dept.)?		✓	
40. Would the proposed change require an amendment to an existing LUP (realignment of an existing trail or a new trail)?		✓	
<b>DISTRICT STAFF EVALUATION SUMMARY</b>			
Category:	Note any unresolved major issues		
<b>Circulation</b>			
<b>Resources</b>			
<b>Trail User Safety</b>			
<b>Compatibility</b>			
<b>Maintenance</b>			
<b>Construction</b>			
<b>Planning/CEQA</b>			
Construction Costs: <u>Less than \$500</u> , Annual Park Operation Costs: <u>Nominal</u> , Annual Maintenance Costs: <u>Nominal</u> , Annual Public Safety Costs: <u>\$0</u>			
EBRPD Staff Team Members: Laura Comstock, Unit Manager; David Vance, Park Ranger II; Raphael Breines and Anne Rivoire, Planning; Terry Noonan and Sean Dougan, Regional Trails			



**TO:** Park Advisory Committee

**FROM:** Raphael Breines, Senior Park Planner

**DATE:** July 27, 2009

**SUBJECT: Review of Ordinance 38 Trail Use Change Proposal**

---

The purpose of this item is to review Attachment A, Technical Analysis of Proposed Changes in a Trail's Uses or Checklist, prepared by Park District staff, and to make a recommendation to the Board of Directors on whether to amend Ordinance 38 to allow bicycle traffic on a trail adjacent to the road leading to the Alhambra Creek Staging Area in Briones Regional Park (see Attachment B for a location map). The Board Operations Committee reviewed the proposal on July 16 and recommended that it be forwarded to the PAC and the Board of Directors.

This is the fifth year of the Trail Use Change Checklist Program. In July of last year, the East Bay Area Trails Council submitted a request to Park District staff to evaluate opening two existing narrow trails to bicycle traffic that are now designated for hiking and equestrian use. The request sought to open a narrow section of the Vollmer Peak Trail in Tilden Regional Park and the trail in Briones described above. A staff group convened to evaluate the trail use change requests and complete checklists for each trail. Staff determined that the section of Vollmer Peak Trail is not suitable for bicycle traffic at this time.

Staff has evaluated the request to permit bicycle traffic on a narrow trail in Briones Regional Park that parallels the access road from Reliez Valley Road to the Alhambra Creek Staging Area and recommends that with the implementation of minor improvements, discussed below, Ordinance 38 should be amended to allow this changed use.

Staff has made the Briones checklist available to the public and posted notices announcing a 30-day public review period, which ended January 9, 2009. Staff held a public input meeting to solicit feedback on the trail use change proposal on the evening of January 6, 2009, and eight members of the public attended. During the review period, the public submitted 51 written comment letters and e-mails concerning the trail use change proposal at Briones Regional Park. 42 of these letters favor opening the trail to bicycle traffic. Supporting comments generally stress that the trail use change would provide cyclists with safer access into the park and would not compromise the safety of other user groups because the trail has good visibility, sufficient passing room and is not steep. Comments opposing the use change proposal typically assert that the trail is a refuge to hikers and equestrians and is well used by both groups, and that use change is not necessary, as cyclists can now enter the park on the paved road or on a nearby multi-use trail (see location map).

---

Board of Directors

Ted Radke President Ward 7	Doug Siden Vice-President Ward 4	Beverly Lane Treasurer Ward 6	Carol Severin Secretary Ward 3	John Sutter Ward 2	Whitney Dotson Ward 1	Ayn Wieskamp Ward 5	Pat O'Brien General Manager
----------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	------------------------	--------------------------------

The trail is almost two-thirds of a mile long and is located on a former farm field and on open grassland and oak-bay woodland. The trail is regularly used by local hikers, dog-walkers and equestrians, as the Briones Horse Center is located at the end of the road and other stables are nearby. The adjacent road, which is a narrow two-lane entry owned by the Park District, is also popular with park visitors and can get crowded with multiple-user groups. There are no records of accidents or emergencies on this trail or road over the past five years, but staff is aware of conflicts in the area among user groups, particularly between dog walkers and horseback riders. Staff is most interested in encouraging visitors to the park, except motorists, to use the trail instead of the road.

The trail is nearly level and relatively narrow, and staff considers line of sight and passing room adequate to support multi-use. However, there is a very short section where the trail ends and users are briefly forced onto the adjacent paved entry road because of streambank erosion along Alhambra Creek. Staff is aware of this problem and has taken the first steps of addressing it by putting it on the capital projects list. The Legal/Risk and Public Safety divisions have each thoroughly evaluated this area and have determined that in its current condition allowing bicycle traffic on the trail would not present a significant safety concern to motorists, bicyclists or existing trail users. In addition, staff believes that use change would provide for a much improved experience for bicyclists and would help to remove park visitors from the road.

Staff finds that use change can be safely accomplished with the following minor trail improvements: replace a short stretch of barbed-wire next to the creek with smooth-gauge wire or another type of barrier; install appropriate public safety signs, specifically where trail users are forced onto the roadway, alerting motorists and trail users of potential conflicts; and continue to clear vegetation to maintain sight lines and to keep signs visible. Total construction costs would be less than \$500.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Review the attached Checklist, provide feedback to staff and make a recommendation to the Board of Directors on whether to amend Ordinance 38 to allow bicycle traffic on the narrow trail adjacent to the road leading to the Alhambra Creek Staging Area in Briones Regional Park.

**CONTACT:** For questions please contact Raphael Breines, Senior Park Planner, at 510-544-2325 or [rbreines@ebparks.org](mailto:rbreines@ebparks.org).

Attachment A: Technical Analysis of Proposed Changes in a Trail's Uses (Checklist)

Attachment B: Location Map

ATTACHMENT B



East Bay Regional Park District  
Public Safety Division

Memorandum

Date: July 16, 2009  
To: Park Advisory Committee  
From: Lieutenant Jon King  
Subject: 2009 Ordinance 38 Review

---

I am pleased to present the recommended revisions to the District's Ordinance 38. As you may know, the annual review process began in January 2009.

Suggestions for revisions were received from staff throughout the District, some on behalf of members of the public. These revisions have been reviewed and endorsed by Public Safety and Operations staff, in addition to a review by District Counsel, and were approved by the Board Operations Committee on July 16, 2009. Following this review, approved changes will be recommended to the full Board of Directors. This meeting is the second opportunity for public review and comment.

Following this meeting, the recommended revisions will be presented to the Board of Directors for adoption on August 11, 2009

Attachment

PARK ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
2009 Status of Recommendations

The following is a record of items, which have come from the PAC during the year beginning January 1, 2009.

1. The PAC recommended Board adoption of the Draft Geocaching Policy. (January 26, 2009)  
**STATUS:** The Board unanimously voted to adopt the Geocaching Policy. (Resolution #2009-2-044)
2. The PAC did not recommend the Board approval of the Contra Costa Centre's Segway Special Use Permit. (January 26, 2009)  
**STATUS:** The Board did not recommend approval of the Contra Costa Centre's Segway Special Use Permit. (April 27, 2009)
3. The PAC recommended Board approval of the dedication of Regional Parkland and Trails. (February 23, 2009)  
**STATUS:** The Board unanimously voted to dedicate Regional Parkland and Trails. (Resolution #2009-3-066)
4. The PAC recommended Board approval of the Special Use Agreement's for Crockett Hills and for Quarry Lakes (March 23, 2009)  
**STATUS:** The Board recommended approval of the Special Use Agreement for Crockett Hills. (Resolution #2009-4-097)  
  
Quarry Lakes.  
**STATUS:** The Board recommended approval of the Special Use Agreement for Quarry Lakes. (Resolution #2009-5-129)
5. The PAC recommended Board approval of the Sustainability Policy. (March 23, 2009)  
**STATUS:** The Board unanimously voted to approve the Sustainability Policy for the East Bay Regional Park District. (Resolution #2009-4-102)
6. The PAC recommended Board approval of the Serpentine Prairie Restoration Plan. (May 18, 2009)  
**STATUS:** The board unanimously voted to approve the Serpentine Prairie Restoration Plan. (Resolution #2009-7-194)
7. The PAC recommended Board approval of naming the Quarry Lakes Picnic area after George C. Roeding. (May 18, 2009)  
**STATUS:** The Board voted to name the Quarry Lakes Picnic area after George C. Roeding. (Resolution #2009-6-143)
8. The PAC recommended approval of the 2008 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. (June 22, 2009)  
**STATUS:** The board voted to approve the 2008 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report. (Resolution #2009-7-207)

**PAC 2009 WORK PLAN** Revised 6/21/09

	JAN 26	FEB 23	MAR 23	APR 27	MAY 18	JUN 22	JUL 27	SEP 28	OCT 26	NOV 16	DEC 7
<b>PAC</b>	<p>Update on 75<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Events (I) – Cameron/Johnson</p> <p>Segway Special Uses and Concessions Policies (R) - Escobar/Rockwell</p> <p>Draft Geocaching Policy (R) - Escobar/Rockwell</p>	<p>State of the District (I) – O'Brien/Cameron</p> <p>Regional Parks Foundation 40<sup>th</sup> Anniv. Goals and Membership (I) - Cameron/ Baglietto</p> <p>Review Measure WW Implementation (I) – Collins/Rasmussen</p> <p>Parklands Dedication Bob Doyle (R) - AGM Land Division</p>	<p>Sustainability Policy and Recycling Update (I) – Escobar/Scheer</p> <p>Special Use Agreement Crockett Hills (R) – Waluch</p> <p>Special Use Agreement Quarry Lakes (R) – Waluch</p>	<p>Measure CC Progress Report (I) - Collins</p> <p>Fuels Management &amp; Vegetation Plan Update (I) – Wiese, Swanson</p> <p>District Camping Plan (I) – Kenny</p>	<p>Community Outreach Update (I) – Parmer/Hales</p> <p>Outdoor Environmental Education / Children in Nature / Interpretative Programs (I) – Kaiser</p> <p>Serpentine Prairie - (R) Wiese</p> <p>Naming Picnic Site – Quarry Lakes ( R)</p>	<p>Review of Trails Program (I) – Townsend/Scheer</p> <p>Volunteer Program Update (I) – Kassebaum</p> <p>CAFR (R) – Collins/Rubaloff</p>	<p>Trails Change Checklist Tilden - Briones (R) – Wiese, Breines</p> <p>Ord 38 Modifications (R)– King</p>	<p>BBQ – Location TBD</p> <p>Workshop On Master Plan (I) – M. Anderson/Wiese</p> <p>Garin LUP( R) - Wiese</p>	<p>Goals 2010</p> <p>Prop. 84 Park Improvement Bond Act (I) – Collins/Rasmussen</p> <p>Americans with Disabilities Act Plan (I) – Radosevich</p> <p>East Contra Costa County Parks HCP (I) – Wiese</p>	<p>2010 Proposed Budget (R) – Collins/Rubaloff</p>	<p>Holiday Dinner</p>
	<p><u>ExComm Subcommittee</u> Work Plan (R) - Pfuehler</p>	<p><u>Community Outreach Subcommittee</u> – Parmer/Hales</p>			<p>Fuels Management Field Trip – Blonski/Swanson – May 30</p>	<p><u>Finance Subcommittee</u> CAFR (R) Collins/Rubaloff</p>			<p><u>ExComm Subcommittee</u> Goals 2010</p>	<p><u>Finance Subcommittee</u> 2010 Budget</p>	

Revised: 6/21/09