

# Appendix J: Stakeholder and Public Written Comment Summary

The comments summarized below were received during two distinct rounds of feedback on the Draft Great California Delta Trail Master Plan, with most recent listed first. This summary is intended to provide an overview of changes that were made in response to each comment. Please contact the Delta Protection Commission (Commission) directly for copies of specific comments received.

## J1. December 2021: Comments on Public Draft Master Plan

Members of the public and the Stakeholder and Technical Advisory Committees were asked to review the public draft of the Master Plan. The comments below reflect a review of that version of the document.

Name Agency/Organization	Summary	Response in Plan
<b>Fran Sticha</b> <b>Bay Area Sea Kayakers (BASK)</b>	Notes that plan appears skewed to toward land based trail use. Would like to see a Water Trail Master Plan developed. If that is not developed, would like to see a lot of changes to this master plan to make it more inclusive of human-powered water craft.	Additional language added to the following pages: <b>Page 2.16:</b> added language regarding human-powered crafts <b>Page 2.26:</b> Added a note about how privately owned marinas vary in their level of public access and may require membership, launch fees and parking fees. <b>Page 2.31:</b> added reference to SF Bay Water Trail to introduction. The rest of the section lists trails in alphabetical order, not related to prominence or importance. <b>Page 3.5:</b> text edited to clarify connection between land trail and water launch sites. <b>Page 3.6:</b> added text to recommend future consideration of a Delta Water Trail Master Plan.
<b>Yuri Jewett, Principal Waterfront Planner</b> <b>San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC)</b>	Noted that Suisun Marsh and the Western Region is within BCDC's jurisdiction and that BCDC is the permitting and regulatory authority for shoreline project. It states that projects proposed within the Commission's jurisdiction must be consistence with BCDC's laws and policies.	The plan notes in several places that all trail projects must comply with local, regional, state, and federal requirements. Additional language was added to the following page: <b>Page 2.27:</b> added language regarding BCDC jurisdiction

Name Agency/Organization	Summary	Response in Plan
<p><b>Debra Banks, Ph.D,</b> <b>Executive Director</b></p> <p><b>Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates (SABA)</b></p>	<p>Strongly supports plan and implementation.</p> <p>Believes that trail can be an economic engine for all the Delta towns.</p> <p>Supports using existing levees.</p> <p>Believes the trail should link every one of the Delta Legacy Communities.</p> <p>Endorse Class I &amp; II trails on levees, paved road segments, and along non-project levee segments.</p> <p>Believes Commission should champion the Delta Trail vision.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><b>Jeff Henderson, AICP,</b> <b>Deputy Executive Officer</b></p> <p><b>Delta Stewardship Council (Council)</b></p>	<p>Noted that the Council is the regulatory and appellate authority over the Delta Plan's (comprehensive long-term management plan) policies. Council notes that the draft Master Plan is not a covered action under the Delta Plan and does not need to submit the certification. However, future trail implementation will likely be require a certification of consistency.</p> <p>The letter notes that covered actions must avoid or mitigate significant adverse impacts within the Priority Habitat Restoration Area (PHRA).</p> <p>Notes concerns with the proposed regional bikeway/Class I trail along the Sacramento Ship Channel because the western side of Channel and the Little Holland Tract are a PHRA.</p> <p>Recommends that "the final Master Plan provide design guidance for proposed trail facilities which may be located near or integrated with existing or future habitat restoration areas."</p>	<p>The Delta Plan was included in Appendix B, Background Document Review.</p> <p>Note that all routes shown on the Regional Maps were sourced from locally approved planning documents, do not represent proposed Delta Trail routes, and therefore have not been modified. Additional language was added in the following locations:</p> <p><b>Page 2.3:</b> added additional reference to the Council and the Delta Plan.</p> <p><b>Page 4.2:</b> added reference to PHRAs and impacts to habitat areas.</p> <p><b>Page 2.16:</b> added additional reference to impacts to water quality.</p> <p><b>Page E.3:</b> added additional reference to limiting use of pesticides.</p>
<p><b>Dean McCully, Vice Commodore</b></p> <p><b>San Jose Sailing Club</b></p>	<p>Wants to spread the word about the Delta Trail Master Plan to all yacht clubs, sea scout units, marinas, kayak clubs, and other boating groups throughout Northern California.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p><b>Anonymous</b></p>	<p>Noted that the figures are numbered incorrectly in Chapter 2.</p>	<p>Figure numbers have been reviewed and updated throughout the document.</p>
<p><b>Alex Padilla</b></p> <p><b>Caltrans</b></p>	<p>Recommend closer coordination with the Sacramento Area Council of Government's (SACOG) Draft Regional Trail Network.</p> <p>Noted difficulty in distinguishing trail types in Figures 3-4, 3-5, 3-6, and 3-7.</p> <p>Recommended adding detailed maps for Adventure Hubs.</p>	<p>The timing of the SACOG Draft plan did not allow for further coordination at this time. However, staff from both agencies are in close contact and future efforts will be coordinated.</p> <p>Edits to the noted figures have been made to improve legibility.</p> <p>Adventure Hubs are conceptual at this time and will be developed as part of the NHA process.</p>

Name Agency/Organization	Summary	Response in Plan
Jeff Twitchell GEI Engineers	Repeat of September 2021 comments.	See September 2021 comments
Margit Aramburu Discover the Delta Foundation	Provided comments on equestrian use (concerned that the plan does not address equestrians), Caltrans facilities (noted the Commissions Resolution 02-12), water trails (more information required), and the Commission role.	<p>Discussion of considerations for equestrian use is included in design recommendations on page 4.15.</p> <p>Regional trails allowing equestrians are indicated in Section 2I (page 2.31 to 2.38).</p> <p>Equestrian accommodations are included as part of the Main Trail designation (page 3.4) and Adventure Hub designation (page 3.5) recommendations.</p> <p>Equestrian access is included as part of the proposed designation criteria (page 3.7 and Appendix H).</p> <p>Resolution 02-12 (support for bike lanes) and/or Resolution 01-12 (bike facilities on levees) is discussed on pages 2.19, 4.2, 4.4, and in Appendix B.</p> <p><b>Page 2.19:</b> added text regarding Caltrans' new Complete Streets policy.</p> <p>Water Trail planning is beyond the scope of this plan. The plan does recommend that the Commission develop a separate and Master Plan that is specific to a Delta Water Trail (see page 3.6).</p> <p>The Commission has and will continue to monitor local planning for Delta Trail opportunities.</p>
Mick Klasson	Recommends closer coordination with Davis.	Comment noted.
Jeff McCormack Reclamation District 1002	Noted concerns about the trail being planned on the railroad levee road between Twin Cities Road and Lost Slough.	<p>Additional language added. For example, on <b>Page 3.19:</b></p> <p>“Careful local planning in partnership with the adjacent properties will be important to determine whether the Isleton-Stone Lake Trail segment is feasible. Particular attention must be paid to the agricultural uses (particularly near Lost Slough and Snodgrass Slough) and sensitive wildlife areas (particularly near the Stone Lakes Wildlife Refuge).”</p>
Stephen Heringer Heringer Winery	Concerns about agricultural impacts on future trail users.	<p>Additional language added. For example, on <b>Page 4.8:</b></p> <p>“Agricultural operations can also have a negative impact on trail users – such as when agricultural operations create dust.</p> <p>In most cases, the trail manager and the adjacent agricultural operator enter a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that clearly outlines what mitigation measures will be implemented and who is responsible for those mitigation measures.”</p>

## J2. September 2021: SAC & TAC Comments on Review Draft Master Plan

For the September 2021 Stakeholder and Technical Advisory Committee meeting, members were asked to review a non-public draft of the Great California Delta Trail Master Plan. The comments below reflect a review of that version of the document.

Name Agency/Organization	Summary	Response in Plan
<b>Bruce Ole Ohlson</b> <b>Bike East Bay, Delta Pedalers Bicycle Club, Contra Costa Countywide Bicycle Advisory Committee, CCTA Bicycle &amp; Pedestrian Advisory Committee, Caltrans D4 Bicycle Advisory Committee, TRANSPLAN Appointee to Highway 4 Integrated Corridor Management, Healthy &amp; Livable Pittsburg Collaborative</b>	Strong support, specific detailed recommendations for the following trail segments: planned shoreline route through the cities of Pittsburg and Antioch; Iron Horse Trail extension; Mokelumne Coast to Crest Trail; EBRPD's Delta de Anza Trail.	The planned route in Contra Costa County has been updated to show this information.
<b>Scott Walters</b>	Support for trail and some specific comments about trail width, feasibility of levee-side trails.	Comment noted. Levee trail design is addressed in Chapter 4.
<b>Trevor Rice</b> <b>National Park Service</b>	Support for trail and recommendation to include Pony Express NHT.	Pony Express NHT has been added to the Regional Trails map and discussion in Chapter 2.
<b>Penny Wells</b> <b>Bay Area Sea Kayakers (BASK)</b>	Strong interest in water launch sites; request to review all proposed sites. Provided helpful site data and photos for proposed sites (November 2021).	Information on water launch sites reviewed and updated. Commission staff will work with BASK to further review sites and potentially post on visitcadelta.com.
<b>Jeff Twitchell</b> <b>GEI Consultants</b>	Support for trail; recommendations for alignments on rail corridors, other northern/central area locations.	Information on trail opportunities in the Northern and Central Delta study regions were reviewed and those maps were updated based on feedback.
<b>Nedzlene Ferrario</b> <b>Solano County</b>	Support for trail; recommendations for destinations in Solano County.	Additional alignment and destination opportunities added based on feedback.
<b>John Holder &amp; Sean Dougan</b> <b>East Bay Regional Park District</b>	Support for trail; note that EBRPD is a strong partner in Contra Costa County and has adopted existing and proposed alignments for the trail through the County.	Additional language added about EBRPD's planning efforts in the Delta.
<b>Kenneth Strelo</b> <b>City of Oakley</b>	Support for trail; minor corrections.	Corrections made.
<b>Simone Nageon de Lestang</b> <b>Bay Area Ridge Trail Council</b>	Support for trail; partnership with Carquinez Strait Scenic Loop Trail working group; language corrections; recommendation for including framework for overnight stays.	Corrections made.

Name Agency/Organization	Summary	Response in Plan
<b>Jamar Stamps</b> <b>Contra Costa County</b>	Some corrections and questions.	Corrections made.
<b>Victoria Cacciatore</b> <b>Sacramento Area</b> <b>Council of Governments</b> <b>(SACOG)</b>	Consider forthcoming Sacramento Region Parks and Trails Plan; Consider West Sacramento trails north of plan area.	Information on Sacramento Region Parks and Trail Plan reviewed.
<b>Ashley Nguyen</b> <b>Metropolitan</b> <b>Transportation</b> <b>Commission (MTC)</b>	Support for trail; partnership with Carquinez Strait Scenic Loop Trail working group; language corrections; recommendation for including framework for overnight stays. (very similar letter as Ridge Trail/Simone Nageon de Lestang).	Corrections made.
<b>Amy Hopperstad</b> <b>Stone Lakes Wildlife</b> <b>Refuge</b>	SLWR cannot support northern region recommendations. Concerned about public use on levees; regarding Northern Section of the Trail; trail users' exposure to herbicides; law enforcement capacity; potential conflict between trail users and private and federal land owners access to property.	Additional language added in multiple locations. For example, on <b>Page 3.19</b> : "Careful local planning in partnership with the adjacent properties will be important to determine whether the Isleton-Stone Lake Trail segment is feasible. Particular attention must be paid to the agricultural uses (particularly near Lost Slough and Snodgrass Slough) and sensitive wildlife areas (particularly near the Stone Lakes Wildlife Refuge)."
<b>Matt Conover for Jeff</b> <b>McCormack</b> <b>Reclamation District</b> <b>1002</b>	Opposed to trail on north side of Lost Slough; concerned about trail on Walnut Grove Branch Line. Suggested alternative routes.	<b>Page 3.19:</b> Additional language added regarding sensitive habitat and agricultural uses (see above).