Approximately 20 members of the public attended the second community workshop for the Coyote Hills Regional Park Restoration and Public Access Project on November 13, 2017.

During the presentation on the project, an overview of the public outreach process and project goals and objectives for the approximately 300-acre project area was discussed. Three program options were also presented, followed by questions and answers. Following the presentation and Q&A, workshop attendees broke off into three groups to look at program options in greater detail, and formulated comments, questions, and suggestions.

This summary packet includes the following work products from the workshop:

- Workshop Notice
- Agenda
- Sign-in Sheet
- Workshop Questions & Comments Summary
- Presentation
- Comment Cards received during workshop

Staff will take the input from the community into consideration as the Project is developed. Staff anticipates having a Project development plan ready to present to the Board of Directors in Summer 2018.

STAYING INVOLVED
Below are a few easy ways for you to receive information and participate in the Coyote Hills Restoration and Public Access Project planning process:

- Request to be placed on the Project e-mail mailing list
- Visit the Project website at the following link: [http://www.ebparks.org/about/planning#patterson](http://www.ebparks.org/about/planning#patterson)

For more information, please contact Karla Cuero at [kcuero@ebparks.org](mailto:kcuero@ebparks.org) or (510) 544-2622.
We want to hear from you!  
The project team will hold our second public meeting to provide information on the planning and development process.  
We welcome your suggestions and feedback in our continuous effort to enhance your experience at Coyote Hills.

**Fremont Senior Center**  
40086 Paseo Padre Pkwy  
Wing A  
Fremont, CA 94538

**Monday, November 13, 2017  7:00-9:00PM**

For more info, visit:  
[http://www.ebparks.org/about/planning/#patterson](http://www.ebparks.org/about/planning/#patterson)

**Contact:**  
Karla Cuero  
Project Coordinator  
kcuero@ebparks.org  
(510)544-2622
Coyote Hills Regional Park
Public Access and Habitat Project
Community Workshop #2

Agenda
(November 13, 2017)

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Presentation
3. General Questions and Answers
4. Review 3 Project Concepts
   (Group Discussion)
5. Summary and Next Steps
DO YOU HAVE A COMMENT?

Comment Sheets may be deposited in the comment box or e-mailed to:

Karla Cuero, Project Coordinator
kcuero@ebparks.org

Thank you!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please Check</th>
<th>General Area of Interest / Comment</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>General Planning Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Goals for Coyote Hills Regional Park expansion (Patterson)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Status of a Particular Resource</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Trails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Specific Management Concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please use the space on the other side of this sheet if you have additional comments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (please print)</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>How you hear about this meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris Barton</td>
<td>EBRPD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chbarton@ebparks.org">chbarton@ebparks.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karla Cuero</td>
<td>EBRPD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kcuerdo@ebparks.org">kcuerdo@ebparks.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Mattingsy</td>
<td>EBRPD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mmattingly@ebparks.org">mmattingly@ebparks.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Sacks</td>
<td>—</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bsacks8@earthlink.net">bsacks8@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allysia Khor</td>
<td>Ponderosa Cove</td>
<td><a href="mailto:akhor88@gmail.com">akhor88@gmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kllonna Olson</td>
<td>Tri-City Ecology</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tec.donna@uno.com">tec.donna@uno.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gus Morrison</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mayorggs@hotmail.com">mayorggs@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long HE</td>
<td>NRCS</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lhe@ci.usda.gov">lhe@ci.usda.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irma Flores-Mendoza</td>
<td>self</td>
<td><a href="mailto:irmafmz@yahoo.com">irmafmz@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>mail flyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAME (please print)</td>
<td>Representing</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>How you hear about this meeting?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tia Lorena Medina</td>
<td>EBRPD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tmedina@ebparks.org">tmedina@ebparks.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jana Saxa</td>
<td>CCCRFCH</td>
<td><a href="mailto:janas@eaoI.com">janas@eaoI.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Myers</td>
<td>ACWD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Michelle.myers@acwd.com">Michelle.myers@acwd.com</a></td>
<td>Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie Clark</td>
<td>SF Bay Wildlife</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maggie.clark.99@gmail.com">maggie.clark.99@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Deschene</td>
<td>SF Bay Wildlife</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mary.deschene@stbws.com">mary.deschene@stbws.com</a></td>
<td>email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Perry</td>
<td>Perry Farms</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dougferryfarmsorganic@gmail.com">dougferryfarmsorganic@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth Ota</td>
<td>Online Elder</td>
<td>no email address</td>
<td>received online most likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred &amp; Conchita Vizcaí</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:sfrederick@ymail.com">sfrederick@ymail.com</a></td>
<td>contact mailing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elena Ariza</td>
<td>SF ECP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sfecf@gmail.com">sfecf@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Gallegos</td>
<td>self</td>
<td><a href="mailto:steph@december14.com">steph@december14.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART PEREZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**COYOTE HILLS REGIONAL PARK**  
*Restoration and Public Access Project*  
November 13, 2017 – Fremont Senior Center  
Workshop #2 Questions & Comments Summary

**General Questions**

1. Is there an update on the status of the school and City of Fremont park property?  
   a. EBRPD has been in contact with both; school site is complex due to Hetch Hetchy easement through site. Park is not a City priority. District has access easement directly from Ardenwood Blvd.

2. Will the existing overflow parking area be affected by this project?  
   a. No, it is not within the study area.

3. How will the paving surface be determined?  
   a. Shared-use bikeways that go through the site will likely be paved, such as a north-south connection or the path along Patterson Ranch Road. Other paths, such as hiking only, could be natural surface or gravel permeable pavement.

4. What about the connection to Alameda Creek Trail? Who built it?  
   a. The Bay Trail on the west side of Ardenwood and Paseo Padre and the connection to the Alameda Creek Trail was built by the developer of Patterson Ranch subdivision as a condition of approval. All of the public trails within the new park area will be accessible, designed with grades of 4.5% or less to be compliant with building codes and ADA requirements.

5. Will the presentation be made available on the website?  
   a. Yes, and maps of the three options under consideration are also available to take home.

6. Have you made any considerations for road kill across Paseo Padre?  
   a. It is currently a ruderal field; the project is intended to attract a diverse mix of species, but it won’t necessarily increase the density of wildlife populations.
   b. Line P (Ardenwood Creek) project included expanded culverts across Paseo Padre and restored the creek area east of the site. This allows wildlife to cross the road, and also connects to a greenway that extends to Ardenwood Farm.
   c. The school and park sites serve as a buffer zone in the north corner of the site.

7. Have you considered purchasing the School and Park sites?  
   a. There have been no formal discussions on this, but the District is working closely with the City and School District on these parcels and other issues of mutual interest.

8. How do we choose which option we like?  
   a. The most likely preferred alternative will be a mix of several options, including a mix of public and stakeholders input as well as a balance to meet the project goals and objectives.
   b. With variable groundwater, salinity, climate changes and other environmental conditions, we are trying to figure out the appropriate vegetation mosaic for the site.
9. For the Alameda County Flood Control project, when will it be done?
   a. Most likely 2-3 years, dependent on funding and regulatory permits.

10. What is the coordination with City of Fremont?
    a. The District has an access easement to Ardenwood Blvd, and will coordinate with City and schools when that is developed. There is no infrastructure planned in the northeast corner that would conflict with any plans by the City or schools.

11. What about event parking? Could you adopt a program approach and enter into an agreement with nearby businesses to use their parking areas? I would like less of a paved footprint. An acre of parking is a huge impact, and I would like the park to have an undeveloped nature.
    a. The District is exploring alternative transportation options, such as a bus stop at the site.
    b. The site’s current unpaved lot at the street holds about 50 cars.

12. People currently park off the street – safety for pedestrians crossing the street is a concern. I like the idea of bus service.
    a. Options for safely crossing the street will be evaluated as part of the project, including working with the City.

13. Sometimes it’s hard to get farm equipment in the field or Farm Yard area, so the vehicle access is important in the entry area.
    a. Comment noted.
    b. An important part of the Project is improving signage and attractiveness of entry area.

14. Are there different cost considerations for each option?
    a. Project costs have not been determined yet, but generally Option 1 would likely be the most costly because there would be more initial improvements at the outset.
    b. Option 3 would generally be the least costly, as there would be less grading and initial capital outlay. (This does not take into account potential expenses such as irrigation improvements and fencing, which would increase project costs).

15. What is Climate Smart farming?
    a. Safe and efficient use of irrigation water, farm chemicals, composting at the right time, and available resources.
    b. The goal is to trap carbon dioxide-soil organic carbon-apply compost to also recover nutrients
    c. Planting woody vegetation, including trees, also captures carbon.
    d. Support for active transportation options, such as bicycle commuting.

16. Option 3 seems to have a lot of mowed hay, there would be a lot of roadkill—raccoons and possums crossing.
    a. This option has about 20-40 acres of mowed hay.

17. The new connector that was put in to connect Ardenwood with Alameda Creek Trail is not right—the slope is too steep or uneven.
    a. Comment noted.

18. Does the parking lot need to be paved? Is this size lot necessary?
    a. The parking lot is only about 1 acre in size (as compared to the 306-acre project area).

19. How much habitat is proposed in each option?
    a. Of the 306 acres, about 280 acres in Option 1 – More Habitat, 250 acres in Option 2 – More Climate Smart Farming, and 205 acres in Option 3 – More Agriculture. Hayfields also provide habitat.
Summary of table group discussions:

Table 1 (Patrick Miller):
- Support for pedestrian/bicycle bridge across Alameda Creek
- Parking should be near entry to Paseo Padre
- Like the idea of more shared use paths
- Better connection to City park site
- Option 3 okay only if there is a willing operator

Table 2 (Bob Nisbet):
- Option 2 was the most favorable.
- 2 and 3 are not too different.
- Protect the site’s cultural resources.
- Provide new trails, but not too many, not redundant trails.
- Habitat is preferred over agriculture

Table 3 (Jeff Peters/Karla Cuero):
- Mr. Perry (site farm lease and operator of Ardenwood Historic Farm) gave insights on agriculture
- LU’s 8 and 9 need to be adjusted to reflect site conditions.
- Explore planting orchards to make produce stand more attractive; need fruit.
- Irrigation infrastructure needs to be included in plan, in addition to well repair.
- The farming operation already does “Climate Smart” farming, such as composting and winter cover crop.
- Crop rotation is important for fields 5-7-8.
- There is a deer problem, and a double fence to preclude deer should be considered.
- Preference for more habitat restoration
- Stop light is needed at Paseo Padre Pkwy. and Patterson Ranch Rd.
- Interest in keeping meadow wet (as well as oak savannah) in northern area vs. mowed native hay
- Location of parking is better in Option 1
- Install a gate closer to Paseo Padre Pkwy.
- Park entrance sign needed near Paseo Padre Pkwy.
- Paved trails will be easier for people with disabilities to use
- Definite interest in climate smart farming
Photos of concept plan maps and comments from table group discussions:

- City water for yard (produce stand)
- Better entrance for farm equipment
- Irrigation system improvements to fields 7 and 8
- Consider some fruit trees/orchard in 8

- Agriculture kept in all three plans
- Community gardening

- More shared use trail
- Provide reference scale of acres
- Like bridge (over Alameda Creek)
- Lease [future planned city park] from City of Fremont for parking or open space.
- I don’t like fences.

- Like bridge across Alameda Creek
- Mixed use [trails] important so can be enjoyed by all ages
- Like Option 2 with only 5, 7, 8 as farming, using parking options on Concept 1 or 3.
Community Workshop #2
Tonight

1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Presentation
3. General Questions
4. Review 3 Project Concepts
5. Break-Out Group Discussions
6. Summary and Next Steps
Ground Rules

- Listen
- Keep It Short
- Don’t Interrupt
- Take Turns
- Be Polite
1. Project Introduction
2. Project Goals
3. Results – August 2017 Workshop
4. Historic Ecology and Landscape Units
5. Land Use/Cover Types
6. 3 Project Concepts
7. Next Steps
Coyote Hills Regional Park

Location: Ward 5 (Wieskamp)
Alameda County
City of Fremont

Year Opened: 1968
Total Acres: 1,274

Recent Additions:
Patterson +296 Ac. (2014)
Church +10 Ac. (2016)

Highlights: Adjacent wildlife refuge, visitor center, camping, naturalist programs, picnicking, hiking, and bicycling
Coyote Hills Restoration and Public Access Project

Project Area

Don Edwards SF Bay National Wildlife Refuge
Alameda Creek
Eden Landing Ecological Reserve
ACFC (EBRPD Lease)
EBRPD
EBRPD Paterson Ranch Reserve
Logistics Operations Center
Line P
San Francisco Bay
Union City

Bay Trail

Dumbarton Quarry (Future EBRPD Facilities)
History & Background

- 1967 - Property Acquired (446 ac.)
- 1972 - Land Use Plan (LUP) Adopted
- 1983-1984 - Alameda County Flood Control Lease (472 ac.)
- 1974-1992 - Other Acquisitions (56 ac.)
- 2005 - Land Use Plan Amendment (LUPA), CEQA, Public Review
- 2014 - Patterson Ranch Donation (296 ac.)
- 2016 - “Church” Acquisition (10 ac.)
History & Background

- February 1, 2017 – Initiated work on Public Access and Habitat Plan for Coyote Hills expansion area
- July 6, 2017 – EBRPD Board Executive Committee Update #1
- August 15, 2017 - Community Workshop #1
- November 2, 2017 – Board Executive Committee Update #2
- November 13, 2017 – Community Workshop #2
**Outreach and Public Participation**

1. **Project Initiation**
   - EBRPD Board Exec. Committee
   - Workshop #1 (Aug 15)
   - Other Stakeholders

### Existing Conditions, Opportunities and Constraints

- **January-August 2017 (~8 Mo)** COMPLETE
- **September-February-June 2018 (~5 Mo)**
- **Summer 2018**

2017

- **Project Initiation**
- **Program Formulation:**
  - **January-August 2017 (~8 Mo)** COMPLETE

2018

- **September-February-June 2018 (~5 Mo)**
Outreach and Public Participation

1. **Project Initiation**
   - EBRPD Board Exec. Committee
   - Workshop #1 (Aug 15)
   - Other Stakeholders

2. **Program Formulation**
   - Board Exec. Committee
   - Workshop #2 (Nov 13)
   - Other Stakeholders
   - EBRPD Board of Directors

**Concepts and Schematic Designs**

**Existing Conditions, Opportunities and Constraints**

**Site Program, Project Description**

---

Coyote Hills Restoration and Public Access Project

November 13, 2017
Outreach and Public Participation

1. Project Initiation
   January-August 2017 (~8 Mo) COMPLETE

2. Program Formulation:
   January 2018 (~5 Mo)

3. Draft Land Use Plan Amendment and Environmental Effects (CEQA)
   - CEQA NOP and Scoping Meeting
   - Park Advisory Committee
   - 45-Day Review/Comment Period
   - EBRPD Board Exec. Committee

4. Project Review and Approval
   - EBRPD Board of Directors

Adopted Development Plan

Restoration and Public Access Project

November 13, 2017
## Feedback From Workshop #1

1. Expand existing Oak grove at site entry  
2. Provide elevated bird observation platforms  
3. Keep parking on the south side of Patterson Ranch Road  
4. Use the hilly area (west of study area) for a higher elevation trail to get better views  
5. Provide a community garden and farm stand  
6. Provide a better information kiosk  
7. Provide water stations  
8. Fix problem with traffic stacking  
9. Provide areas for willow expansion  
10. Area on north side for habitat is okay  
11. Consider viability of agriculture as it relates to Sea Level Rise, 2060-2080  
12. What does a picnic area include? (tables, BBQs, trash, etc. but no play structures)  
13. Parking should be spread out north and south  
14. Trails should be wide enough for multi-use  
15. Balance public access—through, around or elevated as needed  
16. The existing gravel parking lot is too close to the road  
17. Parking should be free  
18. There should be safety speed bumps or other traffic slowing along Patterson Ranch Road  
19. Highlight the park entrance  
20. Fix traffic back up issues  
21. In north area, limit trails and provide raised viewing platforms
Project Goals and Objectives

Policy Framework:

- EBRPD
  - Master Plan
  - Coyote Hills Land Use Plan
  - Ordinance 38
- Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals Update (2015)
- California State Wildlife Action Plan
- City of Fremont
  - General Plan
  - Climate Action Plan
  - Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plans
- Alameda County
  - Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan
- Water District Urban Water Management Plan
- Flood Control and Water Conservation District
- ABAG Bay Trail Plan
Urban Agriculture Goals

Provide opportunities to continue organic farming, seek synergistic partnerships between agriculture, restoration and climate smart features.
Project Goals and Objectives

Public Access Goals

*Develop a more prominent park entrance*
Project Goals and Objectives

Public Access Goals:

- Develop staging/parking, trails and connections, habitat buffers, Climate Smart Park interpretive exhibits
Project Goals and Objectives

Urban Agriculture

Public Access

Restoration

Restoration Goals

Restore and enhance riparian, wetland and grassland habitats.

Design habitats to increase plant and animal diversity.
**3 Planning Areas**

**Three Areas:**
- **South**: Flood Control/Mitigation
- **Central**: Mostly Agriculture
- **North**: Mostly Habitat
## 11 Landscape Units

### Coyote Hills Restoration and Public Access Project

### November 13, 2017

---

### Landscape Units

#### Management Unit | Acres | Plant Community | Elevation | Soils | Ground-water Depth | Sea Level Rise Threat | Comment
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
1. North Slough | 41.0 | Ruderal grasslands | 8.5-11 | Fair – Moderately saline/sodic | 3-4’ | Low | Near School & Anderwood Dr.
2. Patterson Slough | 58.0 | Riparian, emergent, seasonal wetlands | 7-10 | Fair – slightly to moderately saline/sodic | 2-3.5’ | Moderate? | Upwelling groundwater feeds riparian zone
3. West Slough | 16.4 | Ruderal grasslands | 7.5-10.5 | Slightly to moderately saline/sodic | 2-3.5’ | High | Some ponding
4. Oaks | 7.0 | Oak savannah w/ chapparal | 10.5-13 | Very good – non-saline/sodic | 3.5-4’ | Low | Cultural resources
5. North Ag. | 17.3 | Ag. Fields | 10-15 | Very good – non-saline/sodic | 4.5-5.5’ | Low | Best farmland – fertile
6. Farm Yard | 9.3 | Developed area | 12-13 | "FILL" | 5-5.5’ | Low | Includes buildings, Patterson Rd. & Trail
7. South Ag. | 17.1 | Ruderal grasslands | 20-12 | Good – non-saline/sodic | 4-5’ | Low | Poor land farmland
8. West Ag. | 20.9 | Ruderal grasslands | 9-10 | Fair – slightly saline/sodic | 3-4’ | Moderate | Historic ag., ditches removed, now drainage problems
9. Lowlands | 16.1 | Seasonal wetlands & Ruderal grasslands | 7.5-9 | Poor – moderately saline/sodic | 2’ | High | Pondered depressions, farm ditches removed
10. Panhandle | 4.7 | Ruderal, some willow, seasonal wetland | 7.5-10 | Moderately strongly saline/sodic | 7.5-9.5’ | High? | Pondered depressions
11. Flood Control Mitigation | 58.7 | Ruderal, some seasonal wetlands | 7.5-5.5 | Poor-very poor – Moderately strongly saline/sodic | 2.5-4.5’ | High? | Pondered depressions, salt grass ditch, rare plants

Total: 307

---

### Coyote Hills Restoration and Public Access Project

### November 13, 2017
Land Cover Types

- Riparian Forest
- Wet Meadow
- Oak Savanna
- Managed CA Grasslands
- Agricultural Crops
- Cottonwood
Land Cover Types

Riparian Forest

Willow Thicket

Coyote Hills Restoration and Public Access Project

November 13, 2017
Land Cover Types

Coastal Prairie Grass

Oak Savanna
Land Cover Types

Wet Meadow

Cottonwood with Seasonal Wetlands
Land Cover Types

Managed California Annual Grasslands

Mowed Native Grass Hay
Land Cover Types

Pumpkin Field

Lettuce Field
Land Cover Types

Ardenwood Creek Restoration Area
3 Program Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM OPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPTION 1:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION 2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPTION 3:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Wet meadow, Seasonal wetland, Coastal Prairie, Mowed hay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Mixed Riparian Forest, Willow Thicket, Mixed Riparian Forest, Willow Thicket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Wet meadow, Seasonal wetland, Coastal Prairie, Willow Thicket, Oak Savannah, Mowed hay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Oak Savannah, Oak Savannah, Oak Savannah, Mowed hay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Agricultural crops, Climate Smart Agriculture crops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Farm Stand, Oak Savannah, Farm Stand, Oak Savannah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Coastal Prairie, Climate Smart Agriculture crops, Managed CA Annual grasslands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Coastal Prairie, Managed CA Annual grasslands, Field crops, Mowed Hay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Wet meadow / Irrigated Seasonal wetlands with Cottonwoods, Wet meadow / Irritated Seasonal wetlands with Cottonwoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Willow Thicket, Willow Thicket, Willow Thicket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 County of Alameda Public Works Agency, County of Alameda Public Works Agency, County of Alameda Public Works Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 3 Program Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT MAP KEY</th>
<th>PROGRAM OPTIONS</th>
<th>PROGRAM OPTIONS</th>
<th>PROGRAM OPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| OPTION 1: MORE WETLAND HABITAT
*More areas of seasonal wetlands and riparian enhancement and expansion with agriculture mowing native grasses for hay* | OPTION 2: MORE CLIMATE SMART FARMING
*More areas of trees for absorbing CO2, with agricultural fields available for demonstration concepts such as compost and low till management of crop residue* | OPTION 3: MORE AGRICULTURE
*More crop areas and management of grasslands for hay production*

| 1 | Wet meadow, Seasonal wetland, Coastal Prairie, | 1. Wet meadow, Oak savanna | 1. Mowed native hay |
| 3 | Wet meadow, Seasonal wetland, Coastal prairie, Willow Thicket | 3. Willow Thicket, Oak Savanna | 3. Wet meadow, Mowed native hay |
| 4 | Oak savanna | 4. Oak Savanna | 4. Oak Savanna, Mowed native hay |
| 5 | Agricultural crops | 5. Climate Smart Agricultural crops | 5. Agricultural crops |
| 6 | Farm Stand, Oak savanna | 6. Farm Stand, Oak Savanna | 6. Farm Stand, Oak savanna |
| 7 | Coastal prairie | 7. Climate Smart Agricultural crops, Managed CA Annual grasslands | 7. Agricultural crops, Managed CA Annual grasslands |
| 8 | Coastal prairie | 8. Managed CA Annual grasslands | 8. Agricultural crops, Mowed native hay |
| 9 | Wet meadow / Irrigated seasonal wetlands with Cottonwoods | 9. Wet meadow / Irrigated Seasonal Wetlands with Cottonwoods | 9. Wet meadow / Irrigated Seasonal wetlands with Cottonwoods |
| 10 | Willow Thicket | 10. Willow Thicket | 10. Willow Thicket |
| 11 | County of Alameda | 11. County of Alameda | 11. County of Alameda |

Coyote Hills Restoration and Public Access Project

November 13, 2017
### PROGRAM OPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option 1: More Wetland Habitat</th>
<th>Option 2: More Climate Smart Farming</th>
<th>Option 3: More Agriculture Oriented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wet meadow, Seasonal wetland, Coastal prairie</td>
<td>Wet meadow, Cottonwood savanna</td>
<td>Mowed hay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Riparian Forest, Willow Thicket</td>
<td>Mixed Riparian Forest, Willow Thicket</td>
<td>Mixed Riparian Forest, Willow Thicket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet meadow, Seasonal wetland, Coastal prairie, Willow Thicket</td>
<td>Willow Thicket, Oak Savanna</td>
<td>Wet meadow, Mowed hay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Riparian Forest, Willow Thicket</td>
<td>Mixed Riparian Forest, Willow Thicket</td>
<td>Mixed Riparian Forest, Willow Thicket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet meadow, Seasonal wetland, Coastal prairie, Willow Thicket</td>
<td>Willow Thicket, Oak Savanna</td>
<td>Wet meadow, Mowed hay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Riparian Forest, Willow Thicket</td>
<td>Mixed Riparian Forest, Willow Thicket</td>
<td>Mixed Riparian Forest, Willow Thicket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Savanna</td>
<td>Oak Savanna</td>
<td>Oak Savanna, Mowed hay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural crops</td>
<td>Climate Smart Agricultural crops</td>
<td>Agricultural crops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Stand, Oak Savanna</td>
<td>Farm Stand, Oak Savanna</td>
<td>Farm Stand, Oak Savanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal prairie</td>
<td>Coastal prairie</td>
<td>Agricultural crops, Managed CA Annual grasslands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural crops, Managed CA Annual grasslands</td>
<td>Agricultural crops, Managed CA Annual grasslands</td>
<td>Agricultural crops, Managed CA Annual grasslands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal prairie</td>
<td>Managed CA Annual grasslands</td>
<td>Field crops, Mowed Hay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wet meadow / Irrigated Seasonal wetlands with Cottonwoods</td>
<td>Wet meadow / Irrigated Seasonal wetlands with Cottonwoods</td>
<td>Wet meadow / Irrigated Seasonal wetlands with Cottonwoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Thicket</td>
<td>Willow Thicket</td>
<td>Willow Thicket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County of Alameda Public Works Agency</td>
<td>County of Alameda Public Works Agency</td>
<td>County of Alameda Public Works Agency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Access Characteristics

Shared-Use Bicycle and Hiking Trail

County of Alameda Public Works Agency Access Routes

Hiking Trail
Public Access Characteristics
## Program Comparison

### PROGRAM OPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION 1:</th>
<th>OPTION 2:</th>
<th>OPTION 3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Wet meadow, Seasonal wetland, Coastal Prairie, Willow Thicket</td>
<td>Wet meadow, Oak savanna</td>
<td>Mowed hay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mixed Riparian Forest, Willow Thicket</td>
<td>Mixed Riparian Forest, Willow Thicket</td>
<td>Mixed Riparian Forest, Willow Thicket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Wet meadow, Seasonal wetland, Coastal Prairie, Willow Thicket</td>
<td>Willow Thicket, Oak Savanna</td>
<td>Wet meadow, Mowed hay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Oak savanna</td>
<td>Oak Savanna</td>
<td>Oak Savanna, Mowed hay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Agricultural crops</td>
<td>Climate Smart Agricultural crops</td>
<td>Agricultural crops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Farm Stand, Oak savanna</td>
<td>Farm Stand, Oak Savanna</td>
<td>Farm Stand, Oak Savanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Coastal Prairie</td>
<td>Climate Smart Agricultural crops, Managed CA Annual grasslands</td>
<td>Agricultural crops, Managed CA Annual grasslands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Coastal Prairie</td>
<td>Managed CA Annual grasslands</td>
<td>Field crops, Mowed Hay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Wet meadow / Irrigated seasonal wetlands with Cottonwoods</td>
<td>Wet meadow / Irrigated Seasonal Wetlands with Cottonwoods</td>
<td>Wet meadow / Irrigated Seasonal wetlands with Cottonwoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Willow Thicket</td>
<td>Willow Thicket</td>
<td>Willow Thicket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. County of Alameda</td>
<td>County of Alameda</td>
<td>County of Alameda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Questions
Break-out Groups (20 Minutes)

1. Review Options
2. Discuss Options
3. Record Comments + Suggestions
Break-out Groups (20 Minutes)

Comment Summary
Next Steps

Winter 2017 – EBRPD Board of Directors Review of Project Description


Summer 2018 (Board Action) – Review and Consider LUP Amendment, Dev. Plan, Environmental Effects/CEQA

Implementation – phased, 2019-2021?
Information

WEBSITE:
http://www.ebparks.org/about/planning#patterson

For more information please contact:
Karla Cuero, Project Coordinator
510-544-2622
kcuero@ebparks.org
Thank you!
**DO YOU HAVE A COMMENT?**

Comment Sheets may be deposited in the comment box or e-mailed to:

Karla Cuero, Project Coordinator
kcuero@ebparks.org

Thank you!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Check</th>
<th>General Area of Interest / Comment</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>General Planning Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Goals for Coyote Hills Regional Park expansion (Patterson)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Status of a Particular Resource</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Trails</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Specific Management Concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please use the space on the other side of this sheet if you have additional comments.
**DO YOU HAVE A COMMENT?**

Comment Sheets may be deposited in the comment box or e-mailed to:

Karla Cuero, Project Coordinator
kcuer@ebparks.org

Thank you!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please Check</th>
<th>General Area of Interest / Comment</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Planning Process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goals for Coyote Hills Regional Park expansion (Patterson)</td>
<td>Reduce / eliminate area of mowed hay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Status of a Particular Resource</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trails</td>
<td>Additional trails would be great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specific Management Concerns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Priorities</td>
<td>Encourage use of parking areas across Paseo Padre at local businesses,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please use the space on the other side of this sheet if you have additional comments.

Can we hold future meetings closer to Coyote Hills?