

**Robert E. Ward Nature Preserve/West Coyote Hills
Trails and Open Space Advisory Committee
Meeting notes from January 31, 2009 planning session**

Introduction

Twenty-two members of the West Coyote Hills Trails and Open Space Advisory Committee met on January 31, 2009 at the Fullerton Arboretum. The purpose of this session was to share and solicit input on draft components of the master trail design concept plan, including draft recommendations for trail sections, designations, and configurations; trail types and characteristics; and location of trailheads, nature center, and other features in West Coyote Hills.

The meeting began with committee and consultant introductions. Participants included Ginger Britt, Monika Broome, Sue Bulger, Becky D'Arrigo, Frank Fuetterer, Rose-Marie Fisher, Walter Fisher, Chuck Greening, Chris Heusser, Bob Hayden, Tom Horton, Larry Lara, Molly McClanahan, Kay Miller, Jim Meyer, Bill Naylor, Gardner O'Brien, Phil Sanchez, Jacob Lloyd Davies, Aaruni Thakur, Bud Welch, and Jerry Young.

Consultants included Scott Starkey, Steve McCormick, Kavita Rodrigues, Ron Baers, Janet McNeill, and Jennifer Rigby. Jim Pugliese and Roger Bell had planned to attend, but unfortunately could not.

The consultant team designed this workshop to further advance the "visioning" work begun on December 6. Jennifer Rigby provided a recap of that earlier session, specifically, the consensus-building steps that were undertaken to generate group responses to three guiding questions. A brief summary of that session is provided in appendix 1 (attached).

The January 31 session provided participants with opportunities to view West Coyote Hills at varying levels—a "macro" level based on regional trail maps and area maps, and a "micro" level based on trail-specific maps accompanied by images of sample surfaces, conditions, and configurations. Following an overview of trail planning by Steve McCormick with contributions by Jim Meyer, Ron Baers and Jennifer Rigby shared a series of maps and images and asked for committee input.

Presentation

Steve began the program by sharing a regional county map that showed existing and proposed riding and hiking trails, and off-road paved bikeways. West Coyote Hills is situated at one end of a regional trail that goes to Chino Hills and Irvine Lake; it essentially serves as a trailhead.

Steve also shared the Recreational Trails Map from the Resource Management Element in the City's General Plan. The trails in West Coyote Hills connect to a citywide trail system, making the site a critical link east to west and north to south.

Next, a vicinity map showed West Coyote Hills in relation to neighboring cities, including South Whittier, La Habra, East La Mirada, Buena Park, as well as Fullerton. Steve discussed the challenge of designing trails within West Coyote Hills so that they connect as seamlessly as possible to those in multiple municipalities. Consideration of existing bikeways, regional trails, and other destinations such as Ralph B. Clark Park and Fullerton AmTrack Station is an important aspect of the planning process.

Steve also shared a map and images of various trails that surround West Coast Hills. These include the Nora Kuttner Trail, Fullerton Panorama Trail, Castlewood Trail, Rosecrans Trail, Juanita Cook Trail, Bud Turner Trail, East Coyote Hills Trail, and Laguna Lake Park. The images shown revealed the character of various neighborhood trails, some paved and some not, some parallel to roads and some well within park settings. A committee member offered that, within Fullerton city limits, there are about 25 miles of sanctioned off-road trails. At the same time, there are also about 10 miles of unsanctioned trails.

The next series of images focused on trail types and the basis for categorizing various trails. Nature preserve trails are not paved. They are narrow and they go through dense vegetation. According to the California Streets and Highways Code Section 890.4., a Class I Bikeway (Bike Path) provides a completely separated right of way for the exclusive use of bicycles and pedestrians with crossflow minimized. A Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane) provides a striped lane for one-way bike travel on a street or highway, and a Class III Bikeway (Bike Route) provides for shared use with pedestrian or motor vehicle traffic. Multi-use trails encompass a wide spectrum for design; ADA-compliant trails incorporate universal design elements on paved trails with adequate width and minimum grade. Separated paths are another option.

Jim Meyer spoke about the benefits of planning trails in conjunction with planning communities. He explained that developers are listening to the needs voiced by community members—they want trails. Planning at the front of the process ensures good, effective trail design that enhances the housing aspects. It allows developers to build on the opportunity to connect with existing features, address potential problems, such as erosion, and incorporate the need for habitat in a thoughtful, comprehensive, and marketable manner. He reminded the committee that trails either take people where you want them to go or don't want them to go.

Ron Baers continued the discussion with a presentation of the trail concept plans. In the image labeled "existing site conditions," a photo inventory depicted what is seen at various vantage points in West Coyote Hills. Next, the existing conditions map showed existing and proposed new trail segments within West Coyote Hills. One set of colored lines indicated proposed new trails along existing oil roads; another set indicated existing trails; another indicated proposed new trails. It should be noted that more than half of the trail mileage occurs on existing oil roads or other existing roads in an effort to reduce habitat disturbance. This map also served as a reminder of the degree of influence that is available within the context of the habitat conservation plan.

Ron then presented a map of trail characteristics, developed to reflect such variables as elevation, quality of view, presence along an edge, and potential for connectivity, as well as capture the character and "moods" of specific trail segments. For example, the trail through the "great valley" has a gradient of 3.5% following an existing oil road, then climbs to 10.5% gradient, along edge of a neighborhood, approaches the high point, and then offers choices (to the right to continue along trail to Euclid) or to the left to Rosecrans, or straight ahead to enjoy the view at the key vista.

In response to a question raised by a committee member, Ron identified the access points for vehicles as being located off the central road, and the access point for horse trailers located at Laguna Lake.

Jim encouraged the planning team to examine fuel modification zones between wildlands and housing tracts. He suggested these are essentially "free zones" where trails potentially could be added.

Group discussion

The final hour of the meeting focused on issues specific to two documents: trail user considerations and the trail routing plan. We have summarized the collective group response to each question in the following section. These responses are noted in blue. In appendix 2 (attached) a record of individual remarks is provided.

Trail User Considerations

Issue 1. We have proposed creating a “promenade” along the scenic corridor from Rosecrans to the Gilbert bridge and beyond. We see this as a pathway that meanders along the scenic corridor through the center of West Coyote Hills. It connects major activity centers, serves as a place to socialize, and has gentle grades that appeal to casual walkers and parents with strollers.

Key Question: Do you like the addition of this feature?

The group responded favorably to the idea of a promenade, citing its proximity to homes, trails, and retail operations. Several issues were raised regarding limiting use to pedestrians only, incorporating low level (preferably solar powered) lighting and a permeable surface, and addressing issues related to water runoff and ADA compliance.

Key Question: If so, should its use be limited?

The group indicated use should be limited to pedestrians (no skateboarders or cyclists).

Issue 2. The draft trails plan entertains numerous opportunities. For example, there are hiker-only trail segments in the nature preserve (habitat protection); the central valley region west of Gilbert (to ensure a quiet, uninterrupted experience), nature trails adjacent to the nature center (education); key vista access trails (to ensure the same experience), trails along the western edge (neighborhood privacy); and trails that create micro- and macro-connectivity (within neighborhoods and within West Coyote Hills and beyond).

Key Question: We integrated the opportunities you identified during the December session. Are there more opportunities we should address?

The group felt the plans reflect the opportunities. They also noted that near the population centers, trails should be wider and paved. As trails radiate away from population centers, they should be narrow and use natural surfaces.

Issue 3. We have included different trail types on the trails plan (e.g., ADA-compliant trails, nature trails, multi-use trails, bike-only trails, hiker-only trails).

Key Question: What do you think of the placement of designated trails on the trails plan (e.g., hike-only designation in the preserve)? If we do this, do we control access with gates or other means?

The group favored the hike-only designation in the preserve, and voiced concern about safety issues with cyclists correlated to width and “traffic speed” of bike trails. Narrow, technical trails result in fewer accidents than wide roads where speed can be gained. More discussion about cyclists did follow (see below).

Key Question: The possibility of a cyclist-only use of the “roller coaster” hill trail provides a unique feature for the project and broadens the range of users that can be accommodated. What do you think about this idea?

Group response was mixed. Many committee members were strongly opposed to the idea, especially since “roller coaster” hill cuts through the heart of the nature preserve. Others were more accepting as long as pedestrians were not allowed on this trail and the design addressed erosion issues and safety considerations (e.g., “traffic flow” of cyclists).

Trail Routing Plan

Issue 1: The draft development agreement with the City allows the nature center to be located either on or off the property.

Key Question: Do you feel the current location in the preserve is suitable?

The majority of the group was opposed to the idea of moving the nature center from the proposed Robert E. Ward Nature Preserve to the equestrian center near Laguna Lake Park. Several concerns were voiced regarding changing the location. These included pedestrian safety (crossing Euclid to get to the Preserve from Laguna Lake) and quality of the visitor experience (defeating the purpose of the nature center as a portal to experiences immediately availability at the Preserve). Individuals supporting the relocation suggested moving the nature center could create greater connectivity with the nature preserve and Laguna Lake, and would not require the removal of habitat within the preserve to construct a nature center.

Key Question: What do you think of an ADA-compliant interpretive loop adjacent to the nature center? Does this get added to the routing plan?

The group responded favorably to this idea.

Issue 2. We propose rerouting the regional trail at the nature center to avoid unsafe crossing at Euclid. Instead, the trail follows the east edge of the preserve to the Euclid-Laguna signalized intersection.

Key Question: Is rerouting worth the gains in safety and aesthetics?

The group indicated rerouting is a good idea. A question was also raised about an underpass at that location, but cost and engineering logistics are issues.

Issue 3. We propose rerouting the Castlewood Trail from Gilbert to the top of the ridge (currently along the road and next to homes.) This would require approval by USFSW. Relocating to existing oil road would provide space for parkway buffer between road and trail and move the trail away from homes (privacy gains), enhance experiences in nature, eliminate a very steep section on existing trail, and allow for possible conversion of an eucalyptus grove (fire hazard) to native habitat.

Key Question: Is rerouting to create a more circuitous path worth the gains?

The group supported this idea. Individual questions and concerns (e.g., net habitat disruption, access from neighborhoods to trail, presence of fuel modification zones [and subsequent cost to “aesthetics]”)

are recorded in appendix 2.

Issue 4. We propose rerouting the Castlewood Trail north of Coyote Hills Drive. This is City land and a possible site for native habitat restoration that would involve replacement of the existing eucalyptus grove (fire hazard). To enhance the restoration, we propose moving the trail to the edge of the habitat, either along Coyote Hills Drive (closer to neighbors, more visible and safer) or onto existing the oil road north edge of habitat (a trail thru nature, farther away from neighbors).

Key Question: Do you like the idea of moving the trail closer to the edge of native habitat?

Group entertained this idea, but expressed concern over loss of shade from potential removal of the eucalyptus grove. Planners indicated trees consistent with habitat requirements were on the approved plant list and could be considered for this location.

Issue 5. We propose rerouting access from WCH to La Habra just east of the Gilbert bridge. We are considering placing the route under the bridge instead of creating an on-grade crossing at the collector street.

Key Question: Do you like the idea of rerouting the trail under the bridge?

The group, including members who represented equestrians, expressed support for this idea.

Key Question: If the route included the on-grade street crossing, what could be done to make it safer?

The group did not express interest in an on-grade street crossing.

Issue 6. The draft trails plan currently shows separate trails and sidewalks through the east side neighborhoods. We propose combining the two to accomplish three things: conserve space, gain habitat, and separate the route from adjacent homes.

Key Question: Do you like the idea of combining the parallel trails?

The issue was raised that sidewalks are needed on both sides of the street if there are houses on both sides. Some members expressed concern for all-group inclusion—pedestrians and equestrians favor a dirt trail; families with children on bikes and tricycles favor a paved sidewalk. Some members liked the idea of combining parallel trails.

Key Question: Do you like the idea of separating the trails?

Some members also supported the idea of a multiuse trail on one side of the street, as long as all users could agree to accommodate each other.

Issue 7. The nature preserve needs to have limited access points in order to safeguard the habitat and provide safe and enlightening experiences for visitors. How do we control access?

Key Question: How do we control access to the preserve?

The group supported the idea of limiting access to “outside” trails. It was also suggested that certain plant material can serve as an effective deterrent as a “fence.”

Action steps:

Please review these meeting notes. Feel free to electronically track any changes and/or add comments, and send them to Jennifer Rigby (emailacorn@aol.com) and copy Jim Pugliese (jim@westcoyotehills.com) and Scott Starkey (scott@westcoyotehills.com). If you do not have access to email, please feel free to fax your comments to Jenny’s attention at (714) 838-5309. We would appreciate hearing from you by February 27, 2009. At that time, we will finalize this report, respectfully consider your input as we develop the trail master plan and begin development of the interpretive master plan.

We would like to schedule the next planning session with the West Coyote Hills Trails and Open Space Advisory Committee in March to launch the interpretive master plan and begin to identify topics and themes relative to messages we need to convey to visitors on the trails and within the nature center. Subsequent meetings of the Trails and Open Space Advisory Committee will focus on various aspects of both the trail master plan and interpretive master plan. We also plan on conducting an educator needs assessment to fully understand the needs, interests, and constraints of educators from nearby school districts, as well as Fullerton Community College and CSU Fullerton. Once the trail master plan and interpretive master plan are completed, we will move into the design development stage, and ultimately onto development of construction documents.

Appendix I

Summary of findings from the December 6, 2008 planning session

Importance of access: The groups consistently identified recreation and education as important pursuits at the site. The opportunity to connect with nature, become aware of Southern California's native plants and wildlife, savor experiences in the outdoors, and build a lifelong sense of stewardship appeared in each group's individual and combined statements. The presence of "intact nature" would allow visitors to witness and even celebrate natural, functioning habitats that are close to home and of a reasonable size (meaning, not overwhelming). Once opened, the site also will be of benefit to formal and nonformal education groups, including visiting classes of K-college students, as well as nonformal groups such as Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts. The group suggested the site is a "living laboratory" for naturalists, including students, interested in the study of nature and natural processes.

What is equally noteworthy is the interest the groups expressed in interpreting the site's cultural history—the influence of oil exploration and extraction, and the region's human history dating back thousands of years to settlement by American Indians.

Recreation was not seen as incompatible with education. The groups expressed interest in offering recreational opportunities that "improve the communities' quality of life" in an open space (versus formal park) setting. This was viewed as particularly relevant to those interested in exercise. The possibility of trails that increase "connectivity" with other sites and trails, including the Fullerton Loop, was seen as a very valuable aspect. Given the limited reaches of open space in North Orange County, access to West Coyote Hills is seen as a significant and welcomed pursuit.

Target audiences: The list of target audiences included children, family groups, naturalists including birdwatchers, recreational users—dog walkers, equestrians, runners, cyclists—as well as organized groups and current and prospective homeowners. What is notable is that two of the groups expressed a desire to ensure accessibility for all people including seniors and those with special needs. Other audiences of note include radio-controlled gliders, Fullerton College Police Academy, and the homeless. While these groups were not identified as likely target audiences, their presence nevertheless may have implications for trail access and control, as well as visitor safety. It also should be noted, however, that the purpose of Saturday's session was not to discuss the ramifications of multiple-use trails and open space.

Spirit of the site: As far as capturing the "spirit of the site," three trends emerged. The groups consistently made reference to the process and success of establishing the preserve and surrounding open space. West Coyote Hills is not only valued as an excellent backdrop for interpreting the interplay between natural and human communities, but also as a powerful case study and model for other cities. The concepts of "green design," balance of development and preservation, and protection of endangered (threatened) species came up more than once as important messages.

Second, the groups called out the site's topography, including its vista points, as significant features. While the site is important coastal sage scrub habitat—and home to rare wildlife—it is also visual and experiential relief from Fullerton's "flat lands." The groups noted the spectacular views from its higher reaches.

Third, the groups came back to the opportunities they voiced when answering the first question. West Coyote Hills is seen as an opportune place to raise awareness, impart knowledge, and strengthen individual stewardship values among the visiting public. The groups clearly value the stories the land will tell.

Appendix 2

Record of committee comments from January 31 session

Committee comments are noted in blue. Brackets denote words editor added for clarity.

Trail User Considerations

Issue 1. We have proposed creating a “promenade” along the scenic corridor from Rosecrans to the Gilbert bridge and beyond. We see this as a pathway that meanders along the scenic corridor through the center of WCH. It connects major activity centers, serves as a place to socialize, and has gentle grades that appeal to casual walkers and parents with strollers.

Key Question: Do you like the addition of this feature?

Does it exist already? (It is an existing oil road).

How wide will it be? (Hasn't been decided, 8' wide pathway (city standard), casual environment).

Does water collect? Seems like an area where runoff will occur.

Are there plans currently to do habitat restoration along this path?

To the west, isn't there going to be a limited number of town home properties?

Along homes, strolling path would be amenable to homeowners, other users – good idea.

Low grade is excellent place for ADA path. Add landing areas (flat) pockets as rest areas for ADA.

Wouldn't' you want a trail head at Rosecrans? Is the location near retail so there will be parking?

There is a community room in the fire station—can park there.

Sight lines—view of sunset?

Are the oil roads still used for emergency vehicle access? Would the promenade hamper that use?

Currently it is private property and is not being used.

How would emergency services access users? (The collector road).

This is a nice feature; a lot of people can use it and see different parts of the project [and enjoy the] vistas.

Key Question: If so, should its use be limited?

Yes, limit use.

No bikes; instead have a striped bike lane on the road.

Will it be lit at night? Street light will be placed along the road.

Yes, there will be lights on the promenade. This is a safety issue as well.

Different method of lighting, e.g., low bollards.

Promenade serves the community, e.g., access to retail (coffee shop, etc.)

The community might not want it well lit at night.

What would the trail paving be? Concrete?

Permeable pavers (incorporate sustainable design).

Skateboarding? Would it be allowed? It's an ideal slope for boarders, [and thus] in conflict with ADA.

This is one area [where skateboard use] is not appropriate. Restrict boarders.

Use discreet low level solar lighting.

Concern with habitat: no light.

Do you know what the local light intensity of different nearby areas is? At retail centers? Disrupting star gazing is a problem.

High sources of skylight are Imperial Hwy and Beach Blvd., night lights from Ralph B. Clark [softball complex.]

Bulk of area is residential.

There seems to be a great deal of lighting around this area. This is a problem for nesting birds.
Sustainable concern— lighting levels should not impact the environment.

Issue 2. The draft trails plan entertains numerous opportunities. For example, there are hiker-only trail segments in the nature preserve (habitat protection); central valley region west of Gilbert (to ensure a quiet, uninterrupted experience), nature trails adjacent to the nature center (education); key vista access trails (to ensure the same experience), trails along the western edge (neighborhood privacy); trails that create micro- and macro-connectivity (within neighborhoods and within West Coyote Hills and beyond).

Key Question: We integrated the opportunities you identified during the December session. Are there more opportunities we should address?

Yes. Near population centers you want bigger wider paved/unpaved trails. As you radiate out from there, they should become narrow, more natural, and "interpretive type" as trails.

On the east side to connections – Laguna Lake and Laguna Road.

Walking from Lake to Euclid signaled crossing.

Concern about those intersections (how people cross from Laguna Lake). We need to enhance [ensure safety at] those crossings.

Yes.

Issue 3. We have included different trail types on the trails plan (e.g., ADA-compliant trails, nature trails, multi-use trails, bike-only trails, hiker-only trails).

Key Question: What do you think of the placement of designated trails on the trails plan (e.g., hike-only designation in the preserve)? If we do this, do we control access with gates or other means?

Have to inhibit bikers (definitely).

There is a trail that goes up Euclid in front of property?

What is the type of trail? Trail width, etc.? Cannot tell from plan and [there may be] conflict issues.

Cyclists' opinion: single track trails are narrower and traffic is slower. Put cyclists on wider fire access and hikers on narrow trails.

But there are more accidents on faster roads than narrow trails. Narrow and technical trails are better for cyclist safety.

Issues for cyclist on Nora Kuttner: steep grade lets bikers build up lot of speed.

Line of sight is very important. What can you see is very important for multi-use trails. There are methods to slow down speeds.

Key Question: The possibility of a cyclist-only use of the "roller coaster" trail provides a unique feature for the project and broadens the range of users that can be accommodated. What do you think about this idea?

Roller coaster – fall line trail – no way to keep from eroding. Avoid at all cost.

That trail should angle up and switchback to follow the contour. If you have the opportunity to plan the trails, making sustainable grades will reduce speeds and control flow of riders.

Cyclist only—yes.

If it was hikers, need to be fixed rain-ruts, etc., then no. If bikers only, it's okay.

No burden of suitability? Liability on trail.

Need to design it to mitigate erosion.

This is like the community accommodating gangs. I don't understand why we're wasting time accommodating them [bikers].

Do we want to keep the roller coaster trail? If no then ok. If we do, could we keep it bike only? Is it safe for bikers to use?

It should be stricken. There is no way to mitigate it being used in an unsafe manner unless you make it snake. Right now it's paved. If you remove paving, it becomes an erosion problem. Could do without it.

If it is a cyclist only trail, it is like providing a skate park so it doesn't bother anyone else. Cyclists are the largest users group in the county.

They are an independent user group that doesn't give a damn.

It is 72 acres of nature preserve that we have worked so hard to preserve. Who wants a bike path in the middle of the nature preserve?

There is the Fullerton loop trail—city is trying to expand it. Wouldn't this cut the Fullerton Trail? No, it wouldn't.

If roller coaster trail through habitat, doesn't USFWS limit bike access?

I vote to strike it.

Trail Routing Plan

Issue 1: The draft development agreement with the City allows the nature center to be located either on or off the property.

Key Question: Do you feel the current location in the preserve is suitable?

On-site. We have another one off site—Clark Park. Why put it anywhere else? On-site is right next to preserve. Defeats the purpose to be off-site.

Onsite encourages user to go out and use the trails.

Opportunity for public to have an on-site interpretive center.

How big is the site? Would there be parking? Is that included in the area set aside?

This is not going to fit on one acre.

Parks and Recreation's concern [relayed by Bob Hayden]—the space allotted is not adequate to build a proper facility. Looking at the use of Laguna Lake Park (LLP) and Robert Ward Preserve (RWP). Make use of full potential of site. Corner of Euclid and Lake View to bridge both LLP and RWP. Already sufficient parking at Laguna Lake—all the area at the east of the ring for staging. Has to have an appropriate transition across Euclid. For optimum long term use of city, more effective if it serves both LLP and RWP.

Moving the location changes the whole character and the experience for young people, particularly if they are perceived as the "caretakers of the nature preserve." The setting on Euclid makes that very difficult if you take them out of context. Need to feel immersed in the nature preserve.

Parking at Laguna Lake is a horrible idea. Crossing Euclid is terrible.

Parking at Laguna Lake is available and the dirt area is not gated, but the parking lot there is usually full. It would be hard to drag people from the equestrian center. Along Lakeview, it is difficult for pedestrians to navigate. Then you have to cross the Euclid curve where it is so difficult to see traffic.

The city will be involved in the crossing issue.

The location is very important to be in the nature preserve. [Keep the interpretive center on-site.]

I cringe at the idea of interpretive center that does not regard the habitat, e.g., is disruptive.

Key Question: What do you think of an ADA-compliant interpretive loop adjacent to the nature center? Does this get added to the routing plan?

The ADA compliant interpretive loop at the nature center is a good idea.
There must be some kind of ADA compliance.

Issue 2. We propose rerouting the regional trail at the nature center to avoid unsafe crossing at Euclid. Instead, the trail follows the east edge of the preserve to the Euclid-Laguna signalized intersection.

Key Question: Is rerouting worth the gains in safety and aesthetics?

Most people have to use sidewalk – serpentine behind the church – versus a steep drop back there. Will have to create an access point.
Church parking is another hazard.

Yes, rerouting to the intersection is necessary.
Any consideration of underpass at that location? Has been mentioned as something to talk about. Engineering and expense are key issues.

Issue 3. We propose rerouting the Castlewood Trail from Gilbert to the top of the ridge (currently along the road and next to homes.) This would require approval by USFSW. Relocating to existing oil road would provide space for parkway buffer between road and trail and move the trail away from homes (privacy gains), enhance experiences in nature, eliminate a very steep section on existing trail, and allow for possible conversion of an eucalyptus grove (fire hazard) to native habitat.

Key Question: Is rerouting to create a more circuitous path worth the gains?

A great idea.

Nora Kuttner: how will it tie into existing parks road trail?

Looking at the terminus of the trail at the top head, is that an access from the community? Would it extend to connect to the new trail? Right now there is a connection from the houses to the trail, you would need to provide an access from the community to the trail. Have to give up habitat, but you are giving up a trail where you can restore habitat.

There are cul de sacs east that lead to the trail.

Both trails are example of trails in fuel-mod zones. It is not the best place to put trail (due to aesthetics).

Issue 4. We propose rerouting the Castlewood Trail north of Coyote Hills Drive. This is City land and a possible site for native habitat restoration that would involve replacement of the existing eucalyptus grove (fire hazard). To enhance the restoration, we propose moving the trail to the edge of the habitat, either along Coyote Hills Drive (closer to neighbors, more visible and safer) or onto existing the oil road north edge of habitat (a trail thru nature, farther away from neighbors).

Key Question: Do you like the idea of moving the trail closer to the edge of native habitat?

Would depend. Would there be shade? It is nice to have the trees, variety of vegetation. Is there natural habitat that would provide shade?

Have a variety of habitat.

Would Coyote Hills Drive continue to be a cul de sac? Connects to collector road.

If not, there would be an increase in traffic; therefore, you don't want to put a trail next to the roadway.

Issue 5. We propose rerouting access from WCH to La Habra just east of the Gilbert bridge. We are considering placing the route under the bridge instead of creating an on-grade crossing at the collector street.

Key Question: Do you like the idea of rerouting the trail under the bridge?

From horse perspective, allow for underpass. Do not have traffic crossing the collector street.

Key Question: If the route included the on-grade street crossing, what could be done to make it safer?

No interest in on-grade street crossing.

Issue 6. The draft trails plan currently shows separate trails and sidewalks through the east side neighborhoods. We propose combining the two to accomplish three things: conserve space, gain habitat, and separate the route from adjacent homes.

Key Question: Do you like the idea of combining the parallel trails?

Norco has addressed this issue with paved sidewalk on one side of the street and a dirt trail on the other side of street.

This does not make accommodations for all groups, cycling families, can't use dirt road, not allowed on sidewalk. Do not want to be in street; families would be excluded.

Key Question: Do you like the idea of separating the trails?

If it is multiuse on one side, bikes could use it. Horse people and hikers could agree that multiuse could accommodate kids on bikes with training wheels.

Visually, I like the picture of separated paths.

If you can put a sidewalk on one side and a dirt trail on the other side, [that leaves] more room for landscaping and proper separation; better use of land.

Issue is where are the houses? If houses are on both sides, need for sidewalk on both sides. If houses on one side and sidewalk on other side, how do you get to the sidewalk?

Issue 7. The nature preserve needs to have limited access points in order to safeguard the habitat and provide safe and enlightening experiences for visitors. How do we control access?

Key Question: How do we control access to the preserve?

Trail at top of nature preserve—you can control access to the preserve better if you have the continuous trail with only one or two access points to the preserve.

Nature preserve needs to be self contained system with limited access to outside trails. Or else everybody and his brother will start using the trails and that would not be good for the preserve.

Limited access points with controlled access day and night.

Is there a fence between the continuous trail and the preserve trails? It doesn't have to be a fence; it can be natural. Should not be fenced because of nature of the nature preserve... plant material could be used as fence.