

**SACRAMENTO VALLEY OAK WOODLANDS AND DEER
CREEK HILLS PUBLIC OUTREACH**

Sloughhouse Inn Workshop January 29th, 2005

1. Comments/Opinions/Responses to Planning Process Overview

- Docent tours are intended to help inform public about mutual benefits of ranching [habitat/and productive landscape]
- Blue Oak woodlands – the largest old growth forest in the Country! (scientifically important for long term tracking of conditions such as changing climate patterns)
- It's a remote area of the County-due caution is necessary [in terms of urban related problems such as dumping]
- [Deer Creek Hills Preserve provides a] good opportunity for visitors to learn about ranching practices
- The Conservancy should look at mutual support for opportunities with surrounding properties
- Deer Creek Hills Preserve should be a self-contained area - not part of linear system [in terms of trails or access]
- Sacramento County vision for the Preserve is - an open space park – like the American River Parkway (co-tenant to Conservancy)
- The reference to Swainson's hawk/mountain lion in the Powerpoint presentation is "disingenuous [because neither are known to occupy the area]
- Prohibition to OHV's applies to State-owned portions of the Preserve also
- Follow the TNC model: place easements on property in perpetuity for working ranch as one option for master plan
- Revenue from land and property management -- ranchers are valuable partners

GENERAL QUESTIONS & COMMENTS

- Check slide facts for Bickford Ranch reference in Placer County: was permission for photo requested?
- Mitigation & oaks (local projects) How much?
- [Negative} perceptions about cows/grazing by general public?
- Will number of people/visitors be limited/managed? What about people who want to come out on their own- want to go beyond property limits? What about parking for them?
- How are neighbors impacted by trails? Will there be internal buffers for trails?
- Are web grants restrictions consistent with section 815-resource code?
- Is 200-acre in-holding sale to private individual still being considered? specific acreage involved?
- Will bicycle access-(motorized or not) be allowed?- *not restricted by MOU will come out in master plan process.*
- Why talk about larger context – surrounding properties? *Looking at support and collaborations for mutual opportunities with adjacent and nearby owners.*

SACRAMENTO VALLEY OAK WOODLANDS AND DEER CREEK HILLS PUBLIC OUTREACH

- Will actions initiated by this planning effort ultimately cause –impacts private property?
- Need to address potential of future use by mountain bike/horse/dogs and What strategies are there to control/manage them
- If sold to private landowner could a structure (like a private ranch headquarters building) be built on any part of property? *No*
- Private land with a conservation easement is the best option to preserve working landscape –possible strategy for other nearby properties
- How to attract generational [long term] commitment? It is hard to attract and secure
- Infrastructural needs to maintain workings landscapes? i.e. roads, fences etc.
- Pricing structure/profitability is very marginal – how to ensure greater- stability for working ranches?
- Will there be any introduction of threatened or rare species on the Preserve?
- Distinction needs to be made between exotic versus invasive species in terms of management strategies
- Where are we going in Master Plan- in terms of intensity of use?
- Relationship between MOU partners needs to be “cast in stone”
- American River is not desirable model-as opposed to working ranch concept inter-connectivity issue-how much-? How?
- What are the encumbering legal requirements? I.e. easements/MOU – Williamson act overlay on property-specifically CDPR property?
- Potential for conversion to other uses? I.e. vineyards? *NO!*
- In general the public (urban) is not usually the wandering type
- {Working out the} interplay of activities is critical (as a community) –But actions shouldn’t impede what neighbors want to do – need to work with neighbors – strategy example- internal buffers i.e. Rancho Murieta- support for maintaining opportunities for neighbors-
- Concern -working landscape interest may attract inappropriate uses
- Need to determine what is[optimum] “functional” Oak Woodland i.e. too much canopy vs. most beneficial
- Are three objectives [land preservation/restoration, working ranches & public access] compatible or mutually exclusive

Latrobe Road

- Is Latrobe Road excluded? What about liability issues?
- Find out status of Latrobe Road- could it be acquired?
- Road presents a whole bundle of issues-dumping and other undesirable activities –increasing use and demand for needs collective strategies

SACRAMENTO VALLEY OAK WOODLANDS AND DEER CREEK HILLS PUBLIC OUTREACH

Other Miscellaneous Comments and Notes

Data Development and management

- Use and manage DCH from ranchers/owners perspective
- Survey of Blue Oaks conducted by volunteers – to track die back/regeneration conditions
- Soils data are generally not definitive because they are derived from vegetation cover information
- Grazing has been predominant land use since the 19th century but current practices have been in place since the 1940's or 50's
 - Fire hazards - always additional caution during & after May
 - CHP and County coordinate to pick-up abandoned vehicles and related debris
 - Concern: Working ranchers as part of the “urban experience for the public is not really viable for effective ranching
 - Optimum strategy: Working cattle ranch with limited access
 - Important to enable connectivity for habitat & wildlife
 - No clouds on title in any form from landowners
 - Future talks to SVC Board about partnership with neighbors
 - Look for other grazing management plans a
 1. Maintain economic viability for neighboring landowners
 2. Desire to continue support from SVC and County
 3. Create internal buffers (property owned by SVC and County)
 4. Compatibility for recreation- ranching- restoration – habitat – people to see actual ranches incorporated in Master Plan.
- Is there additional funding from County- for clean up of dumping in Sacramento County and trespassing?

Public Access

- Public access vs. private lands – basic concerns from the view of the neighboring landowner
- Working with ranchers (ask when it's good for docent led hikes)
- 25 people already trained to *lead* docent led hikes – more this year
- March is biggest month for led docent hikes about 100 people average 30-60
- Keeping people off certain sensitive areas – 4,000 acres with trails?
- Carpooling is encouraged. Perception of people on trails
- Education - knowledge in history, geology, birds, plants for *lead* docent led hikers
- Where do visitors come from? Placerville, El Dorado, Foothills, Sacramento, Oakland
- Trespassing by mountain bikes & horses on private property a big issue -
- How to handle people around cattle? –
 - closing gates is important-
 - only winter grazing so access can be scheduled around non-grazing period
 - limit trails – hikes –

**SACRAMENTO VALLEY OAK WOODLANDS AND DEER
CREEK HILLS PUBLIC OUTREACH**

- prevent people from coming back unsupervised-
- Controlled parking –
- Avoid trails too close to nearby home/property – neighbors affected?
- Keeping people away from certain sensitive areas – 4,000 acres with trails?

General Comment

- Put maps/presentation materials and notes online from presentation.