



Appendix A

Comments and Responses to Comments on the Public Review Draft RTMP



All page numbers and recommendation numbers referenced in the “Comment Location”, "Comment", and “Response” columns below correspond to the Public Review Draft RTMP released in January 2026. As a result, references in this document align with the structure and content of the Public Review Draft RTMP and may differ from the page numbers and recommendation numbers in future drafts of the RTMP.

Comments and Responses to Comments on the Public Review Draft RTMP

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
Public Meeting #2 Comments					
1.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	May wish to consider trail to north of spillway as hiking only as steps already exist. Current trail very steep & rough.	See Master Response #11. The RTMP did not identify this route as a future system trail.
2.	N/A	Parkwide	Support	Excellent recognition of the trails in the cycling zone. As existing very well built. They should have difficulty rating, as in skiing.	See Master Responses #4, #5, and #11.
3.	N/A	Parkwide	Support	Bike use uphill only is a good idea on Spring Creek!	See Master Response #1.
4.	N/A	Parkwide	Support	This plan has balance for all groups. Bikers feel heard and want to use the park, but also help protect it. All bikes are good with proper trail maintenance.	See Master Response #1.
5.	N/A	Parkwide	Do Not Support	Agree with the folks supporting some bike only trails as well as directional trails. Hiking w/out bikes & biking w/out hikers is fun	See Master Responses #15 and #17.
6.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	Missing Bike-only Downhill trails	See Master Response #5.
7.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	Need better coordination with Spring Lake Park and City Viet Nam Trail bike traffic accessing Anadel is negative for Spring Lake users	This is recognized in the RTMP and addressed in Recommendations P-03, and P-06.
8.	N/A	Parkwide	Do Not Support	Class 1 ebikes should be allowed. <--This please! IIIII	See Master Response #2.
9.	N/A	Parkwide	Do Not Support	Class 1 ebikes should NOT be allowed	See Master Response #2.
10.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	Clarify/redefine access for e-bikes	See Master Response #2.
11.	N/A	Parkwide	Support	Enforcement on non-system trail use!	See Master Response #17.
12.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	Enforcement to keep e-bikes out and bike speed in check!	See Master Response #17.
13.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	Enforce e-bike prohibition Please	See Master Response #17.
14.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	Oversight and enforcement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education • Consequences 	See Master Response #17.
15.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	Water at top of 2 Quarry	Recommendation P-25 calls for partnerships with organizations or concessionaires to provide and maintain portable water stations. There is no infrastructure to support municipal water in most of the park.
16.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	New and non-system trails segment wildlife habitat and migration paths	See Master Response #7.
17.	Michael Murphy	Parkwide	Support	If horse use is only .3% Please do not take any trails from us. We are a minority with little impact.	See Master Response #3.
18.	N/A	Parkwide	Do Not Support	There is a disappointing lack of Horse/Hike trails.	See Master Response #3.
19.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	Minimal new equestrian trails equestrians do not want to go on multi-use trails w/out enforcement	See Master Response #3.
20.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	IF you take away equestrian access on some trails the add equestrian trails	See Master Response #3.
21.	N/A	Parkwide	Support	Looking forward to increased maintenance that I expect to see once user fees are implemented	See Master Response #1.
22.	N/A	Parkwide	Support	P-06 - I would happily pay if \$ are going to park maintenance	See Master Response #18.
23.	N/A	Parkwide	Do Not Support	There should be a trail fee for mountain bikers - yearly, day use	See Master Response #18.
24.	N/A	Parkwide	Do Not Support	Trail fees is a big NO. I'm poor I want to use the park.	See Master Response #18.

APPENDIX A: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT RTMP

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
25.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	P-06 recommendations unclear does this mean user fee (ped, horse, bike, vehicle) at each or most entrance, how, when, put specifics in recommendation	See Master Response #18.
26.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	Verify funding model: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committed budget • Aspirational budget Access/Use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revenue generator (Channel Dr parking area - incorporate) 	See Master Response #18.
27.	N/A	Parkwide	Support	Expanding access is good for the community and local economy. Park revenue will go up + local businesses will see the impact	See Master Response #1.
28.	N/A	Parkwide	Support	Like the scope and long term goals	See Master Response #1.
29.	N/A	Parkwide	Support	P-03! How do you implement P-08!	See Master Response #18.
30.	N/A	Parkwide	Support	I love the Plan! Stamp it and lets GO!	See Master Response #1.
31.	N/A	Parkwide	Support	Love all the added trails!!!	See Master Response #1.
32.	N/A	Parkwide	Support	Thank you!!	See Master Response #1.
33.	N/A	Parkwide	Support	Mostly looks great. Congrats. Great capture of essence & detail. Will any of it happen? What is the prioritization process?	See Master Response #8 and Chapter 6 of the RTMP for a description of project implementation and prioritization.
34.	N/A	Parkwide	Support	Thank you for listening to input from everyone! There is a good balance of additions & conditions based on current patterns of use & need for trail to road conversions for safety & staff.	See Master Response #1.
35.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	Experiences: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uni-directional trail marking • Skill rated trail marking 	See Master Responses #5 and #6.
36.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	More water please! :)	Recommendation P-25 calls for partner with organizations or concessionaires to provide and maintain portable water stations. There is no infrastructure to support municipal water in most of the park.
37.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	Wayfinding signs w/ distance to bathrooms on trails & signage on bathroom saying what they are. THX! Systemwide	The RTMP includes Recommendation P-24, which speaks to developing and implementing a signage and wayfinding program.
38.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	Please consider Disc Golf. United Flyers of Sonoma Disc Golf Club	Although some state park units have inherited recreational amenities such as pools and golf courses, these uses are generally considered outside the scope of allowable activities under the state park unit classification. Therefore, they would not typically be included or evaluated as part of a planning effort.
39.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	Are there any ways to allow for community to assist w/ maintenance w/ trails?	See Master Response #14 and RTMP Recommendation P-02. Volunteering with trail and partners is generally the best way to assist with trail maintenance.
40.	N/A	Parkwide	Do Not Support	Recs should prioritize incremental improvements to system trails	See Master Response #4.
41.	N/A	Parkwide	Do Not Support	It seems there aren't enough resources sufficient for existing official trails. How can you spread work thinner over more features? Take care of and enforce use of official trails in existence already.	See Master Responses #4, #7, #14, and #17. State Parks recognizes the need to take care of what it currently operates but also recognizes new trail opportunity desires are present and need to be addressed to manage all aspects of the TASP trail system.



Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
42.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	Review of existing established trail ~45 miles today: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Investment to maintain existing • Assess priority versus developing new • Many access/uphill routes are effectively impassible for average/learner biker due to poor conditions (eg Cobblestone, N Burma, Rough Go, Creekside; Therefore uphill traffic is biased to Richardson, Canyon on the north/west side) • These same routes are downhill centric for bikers and thus problematic for uphill users (As are certain sections of many other trails) New Trails: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Looks like 10-15 miles of potential • Maintenance burden increased by 25-30% - budget/resources 	See Master Responses #4, #7, #14, and #17. State Parks recognizes the need to take care of what it currently operates but also recognizes new trail opportunity desires are present and need to be addressed to manage all aspects of the TASP trail system.
43.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	Earmark existing budget for trail maintenance	See Master Response #14.
44.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	P-02- Need to have money for trail maintenance with community	See Master Responses #14 and #18.
45.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	Is any of this going to happen? Does this plan mean there is a change in attitude & resources for TASP from State Parks?	See Master Responses #4, #14, #17, and #18. Refer to Chapter 6, "Implementation," of the RTMP.
46.	N/A	Parkwide	Do Not Support	No camping Fire Risk is too high	Although camping was an opportunity for consideration as presented in Section 3.2, "Planning Opportunities and Constraints," of the RTMP, it did not become a plan recommendation in part due to the potential wildfire risk.
47.	N/A	Parkwide	Do Not Support	<-- You can camp without fires in fire rings	Although camping was an opportunity for consideration as presented in Section 3.2, "Planning Opportunities and Constraints," of the RTMP, it did not become a plan recommendation in part due to the potential wildfire risk.
48.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	What is the process for determining whether to incorporate a non-system trail into the system?	See Section 2.3, "Non-system Route Evaluations," and Appendix 6 of the RTMP for a description of the process used to evaluate non-system routes.
49.	N/A	Parkwide	Support	designating some trails as one-way or specific-use only to reduce user conflicts	See Master Responses #15 and #17. Recommendation P-13 does present the option for bicycle optimized zones.
50.	N/A	Parkwide	Support	It's great that you are adopting so many of the existing "user made" trails. Looking forward to some trail improvements.	See Master Response #11.
51.	N/A	Parkwide	Do Not Support	Don't reward "non-system" trail creation by legitimizing bad precedent	See Master Responses #4 and #11.
52.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Support	thank you for listening to us! Thank you for Spring Creek Trail with no downhill cyclists!	See Master Response #1.
53.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Do Not Support	Dont change the MTB trails. Add jumps, drops, berms	See Master Responses #4, #5, and #11.
54.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Do Not Support	anything in a biking corridor should be "bike only" and not be combined with hiking	See Master Response #5.
55.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Support	The mountain bike zone is needed and will be epic if maintained	See Master Response #1.
56.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Support	Great to see all the proposed trail adoptions and the bike optimized zone. I support it all!	See Master Response #1.
57.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Support	Support C-11	See Master Response #1.
58.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Support	Love the bike optimized zones and hope this will include challenging natural features. Perhaps include a bike only (such as hike) in one of these zones.	See Master Response #5.
59.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Change/Recommendation	day of week directional use on Spring Creek Trail. Enforce to keep people honest	See Master Response #17.
60.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Change/Recommendation	pay for parking at channel!	See Master Response #18.
61.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Change/Recommendation	Charge annual or day pass	See Master Response #18.
62.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Change/Recommendation	Permit Class I e-bikes.	See Master Response #2.
63.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Support	All trail improvements!	See Master Response #1.

APPENDIX A: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT RTMP

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
64.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Support	Great plan!	See Master Response #1.
65.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Support	Love all the ideas =)	See Master Response #1.
66.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Support	Replace Rough Go C-3 & yes to all the trails in this zone. Thank you!	See Master Response #1. Recommendation C-03 recommends improving the sustainability of lower Rough-Go Trail by reconstructing or reengineering about 1 mile of the trail from the intersections with Canyon Trail to Cobblestone Trail. Additionally, providing a hike/bike only route connection from Rough-Go sections to Lake Ilsanjo is proposed in Recommendation C-09.
67.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Change/Recommendation	Bikers using Spring Lake to access park and interfering with walkers in Spring Lake	See Master Response #13. State Parks agrees that better coordination with Spring Lake Regional Park is needed to address situations like this. Recommendation P-01 is intended to promote this coordination.
68.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Support	yes to C-07 bikes	See Master Response #1.
69.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Support	Fix Rough Go C-03	See Master Response #14.
70.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Support	yes to C-04 bike	See Master Response #1.
71.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Do Not Support	For C-01, please do not reduce the bike difficulty of cobblestone	See Master Response #14.
72.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Do Not Support	rough go ... should be rough	See Master Response #14.
73.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Do Not Support	C-03 please do not sanitize Rough Go	See Master Response #14.
74.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Change/Recommendation	Keep Rough Go "rough"	See Master Response #14.
75.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Support	Spring Creek off only is good idea	See Master Response #1.
76.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Change/Recommendation	You have hike only but no bike only. new "bike" trails still say multi-use. need directional trails to prevent collisions	See Master Responses #5, #15, and #17.
77.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Change/Recommendation	trail/park access so close to Spring Lake might create high uphill hiker traffic in popular bike optimized downhill area. Concerned but not against. We can get along.	See Master Response #5. Alternative multi-use access from Spring Lake Regional Park is provided as part of Recommendation C-12.
78.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Support	R-09 is good.	See Master Response #1.
79.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Support	Dedicated mountain bike trails are what we need !	See Master Responses #4 and #5.
80.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Do Not Support	bike optimized features on trails are a pain for hikers who don't typically need banked turns.	See Master Response #5.
81.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Support	bike optimized zones are what we need. This will solve many issues in the park.	See Master Response #1.
82.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Support	R-6 for bikes is great!	See Master Response #1.
83.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Support	Really excited for the bike optimized zone and support not allowing horses here	See Master Response #5.
84.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Support	Yes to all of R-06	See Master Response #1.
85.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Support	R-06	See Master Response #1.
86.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Support	Love the R-06 bike zone!	See Master Response #1.
87.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Support	R-06 is good.	See Master Response #1.
88.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Support	I love the bike optimized area of R-6	See Master Response #1.
89.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Support	Love to R-06 adoption. Thanks!	See Master Response #1.
90.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Support	On R-06 & R-07 trails, do not allow horses. To many blind areas for accidents.	See Master Response #5. Recommendation R-06 includes bicycling trails (hike/bike) and would not allow horses.
91.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Do Not Support	NO R-06 - wildlife deserves an area not cut up by trails. R-06 is an illegal trail and should not be Legitimized	See Master Response #4, #5, #7, and #11.



Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
92.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Change/Recommendation	We need more biking zones (Manzanita)	See Master Response #4, #5, #7, and #11.
93.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Change/Recommendation	Area between R-05 + R-10 should be included for bikes! Changes could be made to avoid water resources	See Master Response #4, #5, #7, and #11.
94.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Change/Recommendation	R-5 could be another bike optimized area	See Master Response #4, #5, #7, and #11.
95.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Change/Recommendation	Keep Darkside. It is one of the best downhill trails in the park.	See Master Response #1.
96.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Do Not Support	How are you going to keep bikes off R-5? Rangers posted at both ends?	See Master Response #17.
97.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Do Not Support	Some of the new R-6 trails should allow horses!	See Master Responses #3 and #5. Recommendation R-07 calls for a multi-use trail allowing horses in this zone.
98.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Do Not Support	Horses should be 0.3% or less of total trails because of hi impact per user.	See Master Responses #3 and #15. The comment's assertion about the impacts of equestrian use on trails in the park is noted. This comment does not provide any specific recommendations for the plan. No further response is required.
99.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Change/Recommendation	Horses have an outsized impact per user!	See Master Responses #3 and #15. The comment's assertion about the impacts of equestrian use on trails in the park is noted. This comment does not provide any specific recommendations for the plan. No further response is required.
100.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Change/Recommendation	Manzanita should stay open	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, and #11.
101.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Change/Recommendation	Manzanita Trail is a must for downhill MTB	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, and #11.
102.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Change/Recommendation	Manzanita needs to be adopted and maintained! If not, it will remain a user built trail zone.	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, and #11.
103.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Change/Recommendation	Manzanita trails should be adopted. Otherwise will continue as is.	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, and #11.
104.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Change/Recommendation	Manzanita trail should not be decommissioned. It is a key trail for mountain bikers	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, and #11.
105.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Change/Recommendation	Manz trail for MTB is a staple & needed Thx.	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, and #11.
106.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Change/Recommendation	MANZANITA	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, and #11.
107.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Change/Recommendation	MTB on Manzanita	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, and #11.
108.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Change/Recommendation	Please add Disc Golf	Although some state park units have inherited recreational amenities such as pools and golf courses, these uses are generally considered outside the scope of allowable activities under the state park unit classification. Therefore, they would not typically be included or evaluated as part of a planning effort.
109.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Support	The potential of the current trails between Burma and Quarry is large. Slope s/b considered f/-way bike if warranted	See Master Response #1.
110.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Support	R-07	See Master Response #1.
111.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Change/Recommendation	Why not end R-08 east end at NW end of R-07? Better connectivity	This could be considered during project specific planning and design. However, steep topography and geologic/geographic limitations could affect sustainable design in this area.
112.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Support	Dedicated walking trail	See Master Response #15.
113.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Do Not Support	R-08 should not be horse only	See Master Response #15. Recommendation R-08 calls for a hike and horse trail designation.
114.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Do Not Support	You have Hike only but no Bike only. New bike trails still say multi use. Need directional trails to prevent collisions.	See Master Responses #15 and #17.
115.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Do Not Support	Steve's Trail is not a hiking-only trail. Bikes are on it a lot. Trails cut through Steve's, etc.	Steve's "S" Trail is designated hike only.

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
116.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Change/Recommendation	Rainforest would need to re-route for horses, so why not leave what's there for bikes?	See Master Response #4, #5, and #15. Non-system route evaluation determined that this non-system route for future removal and rehabilitation to a natural condition. The upper portion of this route is considered to be one of the most unsustainable and resource impactful non-system routes in the park. Future work required to make it a system trail would require reroutes to more sustainable locations.
117.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Support	Great idea For Road on Two Quarry For Fire	See Master Response #1.
118.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Do Not Support	Two quarry should stay as trail. Will be soo expensive and there are alternates.	See Master Responses #16 and #17.
119.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Change/Recommendation	2 Quarry Road Conversion -Cost of this? -easement thu wild oak. Public document? If so, please release it	See Master Responses #16 and #17.
120.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Change/Recommendation	There is no need to convert Two Quarry to a road as there is an access road via White Oak in Oakmont.	See Master Responses #16 and #17.
121.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Change/Recommendation	Please add ADA Trail here.	See Master Response #9.
122.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	Non-system routes and bike opportunities are greatly appreciated.	See Master Response #1.
123.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	+1 for bike zone trails with ranging levels of difficulty	See Master Response #1.
124.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Change/Recommendation	Add purpose built mtb trails	See Master Responses #4 and #5.
125.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Change/Recommendation	MTB features • Drops • Jumps • Berms	See Master Responses #4 and #5.
126.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	Love the mountain bike zone! These will help w/ user type conflicts.	See Master Response #1.
127.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	Strong support for the bike optimized zone and the new trail inclusions proposed	See Master Response #1.
128.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	bike optimized zone will be highly utilized	See Master Response #1.
129.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	The blue zone to add trails specific to mountain bikes.	See Master Response #1.
130.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	Yes to all the B-03 & B-02. Thanks!	See Master Response #1.
131.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	I really like the B-3 idea another great seperation of uses & meeting the desire of the largest user group MTB	See Master Response #1.
132.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	B-03 Yes!!	See Master Response #1.
133.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Do Not Support	Illegal trails continue to be made. What enforcement is planned. Chopping up a wild park into many miles of trails is not conservation.	See Master Responses #7 and #17.
134.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Do Not Support	ENFORCEMENT!!! Illegal trails are being built now. Please move SLOWLY to carve up areas for trails.	See Master Response #4, #5, #11, #15, and #17.
135.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Change/Recommendation	Any plans for Rangers on site at Annadel for enforcement?	See Master Response #17.
136.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Do Not Support	At what point to wildlife considerations happen. I have grave reservations about "legalizing" illegal trail. B-03	See Master Responses #4, #7, and #11.
137.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	Please do not take any trails from Equestrians mm.	See Master Response #3.
138.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Do Not Support	Fore every 3 new B-03 why not add an equestrian trail as alternate?	See Master Responses #3 and #15. There are recommendations for multi-use trails associated with the B-03 location allowing horse use. It is expected that the majority of cyclists using this zone would use multi-use trails for uphill riding while descending on bike-optimized trails. Thus, reducing potential speed differential safety concerns.



Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
139.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Change/Recommendation	No horses on B2	See Master Responses #3 and #15. Although details of the exact alignments of multi-use trails associated with Recommendation B-02 would be worked out during implementation, the non-systems routes in this area are generally conducive to multi-use with modifications. Providing some access to all allowed trail uses in this area is a goal of the RTMP.
140.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	I think there is a good balance for everyone! Bikers are being heard which could help boost park revenue and local economic impact!	See Master Response #1.
141.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	Happy to see huge area legalized	See Master Response #1.
142.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	Love all the ideas esp B-03, B-04, B-08	See Master Response #1.
143.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	Great additions!	See Master Response #1.
144.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Change/Recommendation	It's just been dumb to pretend Henry's Knob is not there. Put it on the map & monetize it for the park! Should be job! B02-B08	See Master Response #1. Henry's Knob does show on the RTMP maps.
145.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Do Not Support	At what point to wildlife considerations happen. I have grave reservations about "legalizing" illegal trail. B-03	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, and #11.
146.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Do Not Support	Illegal trails continue to be made. What enforcement is planned. Chopping up a wild park into many miles of trails is not conservation.	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, #11, and #17.
147.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	Opening Henry's knob zone will be great.	See Master Response #1.
148.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	B-08 Yes please!	See Master Response #1.
149.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	B-09 trail facility improvement - adding a restroom, will be great.	See Master Response #1.
150.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	B-05 Local access is fantastic! Prevent driving for locals, open area for biking <3	See Master Response #1.
151.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	Yes B-05 (Bikes)	See Master Response #1.
152.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	Love the idea of incorporating connection with regional Parks.	See Master Response #1.
153.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	B-02 Yes!!	See Master Response #1.
154.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	Yes to all the B-03 & B-02. Thanks!	See Master Response #1.
155.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	B-04 yes!	See Master Response #1.
156.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	B-04 Connector is important	See Master Response #1.
157.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	Excellent adoption of existing trails above ridge & marsh. Please allow for views to the South.	See Master Response #1.
158.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Change/Recommendation	Please keep Marsh to Ridge connector	Recommendation B-04 calls for new multi-use trail (hike/bike/horse) between the western portion of Ridge and Marsh Trails to create loop opportunities.
159.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	repairing or realigning Canyon trail is much needed!	See Master Response #14. State Parks agrees and included this in the RTMP under Recommendation B-01.
160.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	Ok to improve some trails into "Roads" for fire protection!	See Master Response #1.
161.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Support	B-06	See Master Response #1.
162.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Do Not Support	B-06 would rather it not become a road.	See Master Response #1.
163.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Do Not Support	Please keep deep gravel to a minimum on roads	See Master Response #1.
164.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Do Not Support	Regarding the Marsh Trail to road conversion. Please keep a natural surface! Thanks!	See Master Response #1. The Marsh Trail trail-to-road conversion would maintain a natural surface.
165.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Do Not Support	Don't turn Marsh Trail into a road.	See Master Response #16 and #17.
166.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Do Not Support	I do not like the proposed trail to road conversion for Marsh.	See Master Response #16 and #17.

APPENDIX A: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT RTMP

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
167.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Change/Recommendation	There is a non system trail from Viet Veterans Trail to the major switchback on Canyon. It should be included as a good alternate to Canyon.	See Master Response #13. State Parks is aware of this route but has not included in the RTMP because it is not located on TASP property. This location has been identified as an emergency vehicle access at the park boundary. State Parks acknowledges this location is used by the surrounding community for access to the TASP trail system.
168.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Support	L-03 yes!	See Master Response #1.
169.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Support	Yes to L-03 trail use designation change!	See Master Response #1.
170.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Support	Very pleased to see L-02 upgrade of Fryman Canyon Trail. How would you keep bikes and dogs off the trail?	See Master Response #17. Recommendation L-02 calls for segments of hike only, hike/bike, and hike/bike/horse trails in the Lawndale Zone.
171.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Do Not Support	The hiking only section of the current Rhyolite trail will be very likely used by bikes	See Master Response #11, #15 and #17.
172.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Do Not Support	The L-01 & L-02 proposed trails exist in a sea of illegal trails. Without enforcement this system is only open to more abuse.	See Master Response #4, #5, #11, #15 and #17.
173.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Do Not Support	Again enforcement - move slowly - illegal trails are still being made.	See Master Response #4, #5, #11, #15 and #17.
174.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Support	I appreciate the limiting of trails in this zone for natural resource prioritization	See Master Response #1.
175.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Do Not Support	Conservation first!	See Master Responses #4, #7, and #11.
176.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Do Not Support	Please dont take away trail L5 away from horses!	See Master Response #3.
177.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Change/Recommendation	Please do not take horse trails away. we are a minority!	See Master Response #3.
178.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Change/Recommendation	Prohibit horses on L-2. Their impact is too high.	See Master Response #3 and #15. Although details of the exact alignments of the multi-use trail associated with Recommendation L-02 would be worked out during implementation of the RTMP, there is an existing non-system route in this area that could be generally sustainable for multi-use with modifications. A former roadbed could provide access for approximately half of the proposed multi-use trail.
179.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Change/Recommendation	Paid parking at Lawndale	See Master Response #18.
180.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Change/Recommendation	Please put up QR codes for paid parking	See Master Response #18.
181.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Support	Love the added trails!	See Master Response #1.
182.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Do Not Support	Keep connector between L-01 and L-02 near the poweline road on Lawndale flat section!	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, #11, and #15. This non-system route was evaluated and identified for future removal and rehabilitation to a natural condition. See the Trione-Annadel State Park Non-system Route Evaluation Explorer available through the TASP RTMP webpage here: www.parks.ca.gov/TASPRTMP for further explanation. Responses suggest this is a good singletrack trail alternative to Lawndale trail enjoyable by cyclists. However, the primary goals and objectives for the Lawndale Zone are centered primarily around habitat and resource preservation and providing multi-use trails to enjoy the resources.
183.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Do Not Support	Please keep the connection from Lawndale to L-02	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, #11, and #15. This non-system route was evaluated and identified for future removal and rehabilitation to a natural condition. See Trione-Annadel State Park Non-system Route Evaluation Explorer available through the TASP RTMP webpage here www.parks.ca.gov/TASPRTMP for further explanation. Responses suggest this is a good single-track trail alternative to Lawndale trail enjoyable by cyclist. However, the primary goals and objectives for the Lawndale zone are centered primarily around habitat and resource preservation and multi-use trails to enjoy the resources.



Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
184.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Change/Recommendation	Formalize the connection between Lawndale fire road and L-02 trails (760/Woodley/Jasons Upper section)	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, #11, and #15. This non-system route was evaluated and identified for future removal and rehabilitation to a natural condition. See Trione-Annadel State Park Non-system Route Evaluation Explorer available through the TASP RTMP webpage here www.parks.ca.gov/TASPRTMP for further explanation. Responses suggest this is a good single-track trail alternative to Lawndale trail enjoyable by cyclist. However, the primary goals and objectives for the Lawndale zone are centered primarily around habitat and resource preservation and multi-use trails to enjoy the resources.
185.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Change/Recommendation	Keep the connector along the power lines from L-01 to L-02	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, #11, and #15. This non-system route was evaluated and identified for future removal and rehabilitation to a natural condition. See Trione-Annadel State Park Non-system Route Evaluation Explorer available through the TASP RTMP webpage here www.parks.ca.gov/TASPRTMP for further explanation. Responses suggest this is a good single-track trail alternative to Lawndale trail enjoyable by cyclist. However, the primary goals and objectives for the Lawndale zone are centered primarily around habitat and resource preservation and multi-use trails to enjoy the resources.
186.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Change/Recommendation	Keep connector trails from Lawndale to L-01 + L-02	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, #11, and #15. This non-system route was evaluated and identified for future removal and rehabilitation to a natural condition. See Trione-Annadel State Park Non-system Route Evaluation Explorer available through the TASP RTMP webpage here www.parks.ca.gov/TASPRTMP for further explanation. Responses suggest this is a good single-track trail alternative to Lawndale trail enjoyable by cyclist. However, the primary goals and objectives for the Lawndale zone are centered primarily around habitat and resource preservation and multi-use trails to enjoy the resources.
187.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Change/Recommendation	Hire crews to trim back the poison oak, especially on upper Lawndale Trail	See Master Response #14.
188.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Change/Recommendation	Add water resource and maybe bathroom/vault toilet	Recommendation L-04 calls for Lawndale Trailhead improvements by providing gated access, restroom, picnic area, and potentially drinking water.
189.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Change/Recommendation	Please add disc golf	Although some state park units have inherited recreational amenities such as pools and golf courses, these uses are generally considered outside the scope of allowable activities under the state park unit classification. Therefore, they would not typically be included or evaluated as part of a planning effort.
190.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Support	I support and L-05 access to Oakmont	See Master Response #1.
191.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Support	Excellent recognition of use of access L-05	See Master Response #1.
192.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Support	Maintaining the trail through Fryman Canyon is a great idea!	Recommendation L-01 and L-02 calls for new system routes in the Frey Canyon Area.
193.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Do Not Support	The proposed L-02 bike/hike trail down to Woodley is way too steep to be maintainable	State Parks evaluations concluded that the proposed hike/bike trails in Recommendation L-02 have generally sustainable slopes but recognizes that reroutes may be required if the existing non-system route corridors are used.
194.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Support	Love the connections to the quarry	See Master Response #1.
195.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Support	I support the L-02 additions	See Master Response #1.
196.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Support	L-02 will be a great trail!	See Master Response #1.
197.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Support	Yes! to L-02 new trails! Not too steep for bikes!	See Master Response #1.
198.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Change/Recommendation	Connector trail from Lawndale to Schultz	See Master Response #7.
199.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Change/Recommendation	Dirt connection between Lawndale and Schultz.	See Master Response #7.
200.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Change/Recommendation	Connect Lawndale to Schultz ! (on trail)	See Master Response #7.

APPENDIX A: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT RTMP

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
201.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Change/Recommendation	A connector from lower Lawndale to Lower Schultz would be great	See Master Response #7.
202.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Change/Recommendation	Connect Lawndale to Schultz	See Master Response #7.
203.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Change/Recommendation	Please connect Lawndale to Schultz at the top along the power line	See Master Response #7.
204.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Change/Recommendation	Trail from Lawndale to Schultz	See Master Response #7.
205.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Do Not Support	Why are bicycling trails being combined with hiking? These should be separate.	See Master Response #5.
206.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Do Not Support	The only reason Rhyolite stays clear is because bikes use it. Very few hikers get that far.	See Master Response #1.
207.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Support	Parking at Schultz trailhead inside gate + property. Maybe space for 4-6 vehicles on gravel parking.	See Master Response #12.
208.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Change/Recommendation	Please add disc golf	Although some state park units have inherited recreational amenities such as pools and golf courses, these uses are generally considered outside the scope of allowable activities under the state park unit classification. Therefore, they would not typically be included or evaluated as part of a planning effort.
209.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Change/Recommendation	Dirt connection between Lawndale and Schultz. Add water resource and maybe bathroom/vault toilet.	See Master Response #7.
210.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Support	Agree - it would be great to get more access to the Schultz trailhead	See Master Response #12.
211.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Support	S-05 connection to Sonoma Mountain Vernal Pools would be fantastic.	See Master Response #1.
212.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Support	I like S-05 for better access	See Master Response #1.
213.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Support	S-05 - Schultz Zone - yes to access South that could connect in the future to Somona Mountain Regional/Jack London Park for bike access	See Master Response #1.
214.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Support	S-05 yes!!!	See Master Response #1.
215.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Support	I like S5	See Master Response #1.
216.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Support	Yes to S-05! This would be a lovely loop for bikes	See Master Response #1.
217.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Support	S-03 is a welcome connection	See Master Response #1.
218.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Support	S-03 yes please great connector	See Master Response #1.
219.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Support	S-03 connector is good	See Master Response #1.
220.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Support	I like S-03	See Master Response #1.
221.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Support	Yes to S3	See Master Response #1.
222.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Support	Like S-03 idea	See Master Response #1.
223.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Do Not Support	I don't like S-03. This currently illegal trail goes through a sensitive wildlife area. Primarily as a "short cut". Enough with short cutting as a policy.	State Parks agrees that general shortcut trails are not desired, but this non-system route does get used as a connection between Ridge and Marsh Trails. Recommendation R-03 calls for avoiding resource impacts on the intermittent stream and low-lying terrain by routing the trail to upland locations and/or using elevated structures such as causeways and drain lenses.
224.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Change/Recommendation	Connector trail from Lawndale to Schultz	See Master Response #7.
225.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Change/Recommendation	If S-03 continues straight towards boundary, ther is a non-system trail that may be in better shape that the section of ridge that needs rework in marsh direction.	See Master Response #1.
226.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Change/Recommendation	Trail connection between the bottom of Schultz and Lawndale to get off the road	See Master Response #7.
227.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Support	I like S1	See Master Response #1.
228.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Support	Yes to S1	See Master Response #1.



Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
229.	N/A	Parkwide	Do Not Support	No "monitoring technology" this is a recreation area	See Master Response #10. Recommendation P-11 will be revised to remove the bullet, "Seek out new technologies to detect non-system route development and use." Recommendation P-19 will be revised to include the objective, "Protect natural and cultural resources," and "... or use of detection technology," in the recommendation text.
230.	N/A	Parkwide	Do Not Support	P-19 - No monitoring technology. Not necessary. Ripe for abuse.	See Master Response #10. Recommendation P-11 will be revised to remove the bullet, "Seek out new technologies to detect non-system route development and use." Recommendation P-19 will be revised to include the objective, "Protect natural and cultural resources," and "... or use of detection technology," in the recommendation text.
231.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	Please make sure to speak & connect with groups that work with people of all ability levels - I.E. ADA	See Master Response #9. State Parks will continue to work with communities and groups of all ability and access levels.
232.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	Some way to educate around giving way to others - stay to the right - etc... -hiker	See Master Responses #6 and #17. Language addressing education regarding trail rules and etiquette will be added to the RTMP parkwide recommendations.
233.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	More trash cans please ty	Trash cans would be included with the other trail amenities in Recommendation P-25.
234.	N/A	Parkwide	Support	Important to contract with non-profit trail building organizations to do trail work	Recommendation P-02 addresses this issue and the title will be revised to, "Trail Project and Maintenance Agreements."
235.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	This plan needs to Be translated + accessible in Spanish - to get input from our community.	State Parks has made a concerted effort to reach out to the Spanish-speaking community by providing all public outreach and meeting materials in Spanish as well as English. In addition, Spanish speaking staff have been available at all public meetings. These resources for Spanish speakers will continue for future outreach efforts. Although it is not currently possible to provide the RTMP in Spanish, State Parks encourages the use of translation technology for this purpose as well as encouraging people to contact State Parks via email at trails@parks.ca.gov for additional assistance.
236.	N/A	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	fire-hardened trails (SBTS model), especially in the eastern + southern sections of the park	Trail side vegetation is generally managed according to <i>State Parks Vegetation Management Guidelines for Roads and Trails of the State Park System</i> and is managed consistently with the current park Wildfire Management Plan and Wildfire and Forest Resilience program.
237.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Support	Please allow riding downhill Spring Creek at certain times of the day	See Master Responses #15 and #17. Language will be added to Recommendation C-05 describing that alternative bicycling opportunities would be provided in the area prior to changing the trail direction management approach for cyclists.
238.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Do Not Support	uphill and downhill on Spring Creek	See Master Responses #15 and #17. Language will be added to Recommendation C-05 describing that alternative bicycling opportunities would be provided in the area prior to changing the trail direction management approach for cyclists.
239.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Do Not Support	Make C-5 multi-directional for bikes	See Master Responses #15 and #17. Language will be added to Recommendation C-05 describing that alternative bicycling opportunities would be provided in the area prior to changing the trail direction management approach for cyclists.
240.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Do Not Support	no downhill on Spring Creek design trail to accommodate both ways	See Master Responses #15 and #17. Language will be added to Recommendation C-05 describing that alternative bicycling opportunities would be provided in the area prior to changing the trail direction management approach for cyclists.
241.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Change/Recommendation	No to C5 bikes like the downhill also	See Master Responses #15 and #17. Language will be added to Recommendation C-05 describing that alternative bicycling opportunities would be provided in the area prior to changing the trail direction management approach for cyclists.

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
242.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Change/Recommendation	consider different time management for Spring Creek Trail. For example: M-F Ok, Sat & Sun No Bikes from 8am-3pm	See Master Responses #15 and #17. Language will be added to Recommendation C-05 describing that alternative bicycling opportunities would be provided in the area prior to changing the trail direction management approach for cyclists.
243.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Change/Recommendation	day of week directional use on Spring Creek Trail. Enforce to keep people honest	See Master Responses #15 and #17. Language will be added to Recommendation C-05 describing that alternative bicycling opportunities would be provided in the area prior to changing the trail direction management approach for cyclists.
244.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Change/Recommendation	Sprin Creek downhill weekends only	See Master Responses #15 and #17. Language will be added to Recommendation C-05 describing that alternative bicycling opportunities would be provided in the area prior to changing the trail direction management approach for cyclists.
245.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Change/Recommendation	no bike downhill on Spring Creek - Where will they go down, canyon @ 15mph?	See Master Responses #15 and #17. Language will be added to Recommendation C-05 describing that alternative bicycling opportunities would be provided in the area prior to changing the trail direction management approach for cyclists.
246.	N/A	Cobblestone Zone	Change/Recommendation	Make C-05 horse/hike instead of R-08	See Master Responses #15 and #17.
247.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Do Not Support	I'll miss the trail between Steves & R-01 as it's a nicer alternative for hikers not to have to walk on the gravel road of Richardson.	See Master Response #7.
248.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Do Not Support	R-08 should be directional downhill for bikes. It has been 1000% maintained by mtbers. Completely too steep & dangerous for horses.	See Master Response #15.
249.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Do Not Support	R-8 should be up hill only for bikes like spring creek. R-5 should be open to bikes.	See Master Response #15.
250.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Do Not Support	Don't understand, Don't like the horse/hike only R-08 trail. Why not uphill directional like Spring Creek in Cobblestone Zone? Or a parallel trail that is bike only.	See Master Response #15.
251.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Do Not Support	R-05 could be multi-use	See Master Response #15. R-05 would make a connection to Steve's "S" Trail on one end, which is designated hike only, and the more moderately sloped upper reaches of North Burma Trail on the other end. The intent is to provide a primarily hike-only experience from Warren Richardson Trailhead to the False Lake Meadow area avoiding potential hiking and bicycling safety concerns associated with speed differentials along the lower and steeper portions of the North Burma Trail.
252.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Do Not Support	R-05 should be Bike & Hike	See Master Response #15. R-05 would make a connection to Steve's "S" Trail on one end, which is designated hike only, and the more moderately sloped upper reaches of North Burma Trail on the other end. The intent is to provide a primarily hike-only experience from Warren Richardson Trailhead to the False Lake Meadow area avoiding potential hiking and bicycling safety concerns associated with speed differentials along the lower and steeper portions of the North Burma Trail.
253.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Do Not Support	Ditto. R-05 should be Bike & Hike	See Master Response #15. R-05 would make a connection to Steve's "S" Trail on one end, which is designated hike only, and the more moderately sloped upper reaches of North Burma Trail on the other end. The intent is to provide a primarily hike-only experience from Warren Richardson Trailhead to the False Lake Meadow area avoiding potential hiking and bicycling safety concerns associated with speed differentials along the lower and steeper portions of the North Burma Trail.
254.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Change/Recommendation	ADA paralleling canyon to the lake	See Master Response #9. Given the steep terrain and associated resources impacts that would be unavoidable with aligning an ADA or accessible trail through this area, State Parks does not consider this to be a reasonably feasible recommendation.
255.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Change/Recommendation	What about addressing weather conditions when trails shouldn't be used to lower impact?	The RTMP will add a recommendation to educate the trail users regarding the impacts of trail use during wet weather conditions as well as providing a list of trails more and less suitable for use during wet weather conditions.



Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
256.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Do Not Support	Henry's Knob sounds phallic. It should be the BOOB.	State Parks is using the name that has been most traditionally used to describe this prominent landform in the RTMP. Future name changes would be considered.
257.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Do Not Support	Call it Mountain Biking not Bicycling	The RTMP uses the term "bicycling" as an inclusive term that encompasses all non-motorized and pedal-assist bicycle uses. This includes mountain biking and gravel biking. State Parks understands that mountain bikes are the primary bike type used at TASP but recognizes gravel bikes are also used.
258.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Do Not Support	There are no mountains in Annadel. It's not "mountain biking."	The RTMP uses the term "bicycling" as an inclusive term that encompasses all non-motorized and pedal-assist bicycle uses. This includes mountain biking and gravel biking. State Parks understands that mountain bikes are the primary bike type used at TASP but recognizes gravel bikes are also used.
259.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Change/Recommendation	There is no future connection to the Geary Ranch parcel. That will happen. Might as well show a future connection.	See Master Response #13. Geary Ranch is a privately owned property with a conservation easement. There are currently no plans for public access to this property. Maps in the RTMP will be updated to distinguish that Geary Ranch is privately owned with a conservation easement over it.
260.	N/A	Bennett Zone	Do Not Support	If Marsh becomes a fire road, it should not go through the redwood grove area.	See Master Responses #16 and #17. The recommended trail-to-road conversion would stop prior to the "redwood grove," which is where the trail becomes more of singletrack trail as opposed to a trail on a former roadbed.
261.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Change/Recommendation	Lawndale trailhead would benefit from more space for vehicles	Recommendation L-04 will be modified to include a minor expansion of parking if conditions are suitable.
262.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Change/Recommendation	Rhyolite is one of only two hike only trails. Preserve low impact trails.	See Master Response #15. Allowing multi-use on Rhyolite Trail provides an opportunity for all trail users to enjoy the natural resources of this area.
263.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Do Not Support	S-03 breaks up important contiguous wildlife habitat	See Master Response #7. State Parks acknowledges that this route has the potential to further fragment wildlife habitat. At the same time, there is a recognized need for connectivity between the Ridge and Marsh trails. Given this, complete elimination of the route may not be reasonably feasible. Instead, development of a more sustainable trail alignment could help maintain this desired connection while minimizing impacts to sensitive wildlife and plant habitats. Recommendation R-03 addresses these concerns by calling for avoidance of resource impacts to the intermittent stream and adjacent low-lying areas. This can be achieved by routing the trail through more suitable upland locations and, where necessary, incorporating elevated structures such as causeways or drain lenses to protect underlying resources.
264.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Change/Recommendation	Can Schultz trail users be **** when trail is inaccessible due to high water in creek?	State Parks is aware of this issue and is planning to install an appropriate water crossing in the future.
265.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Change/Recommendation	What happened to the waterfall trail on Schultz in the draft plan?	See Master Response #7. State Parks was unable to locate or determine the prior existence of this route. It is believed to be in Schultz Canyon, which is a location the RTMP does not want to further fragment with trails. Please send any additional information you might have on the waterfall trail location to trails@parks.ca.gov.
266.	N/A	Schultz Zone	Do Not Support	S5 vernal pools are sensitive areas - limit trail to hiker only	See Master Response #8. Future project-level planning and associated environmental review would be conducted to determine appropriate locations and designs to avoid any significant resource impacts.
267.	N/A	Richardson Zone	Change/Recommendation	South Burma leading into Buick Meadow is almost unusable (R-02). This issue seems to have accelerated w/ the advent of high-torque ebikes. How can you really fix R-02	See Master Response #14. This trail will be reconstructed by pulling in the berm, implementing outsloped drainage where possible, and adding drainage features such as rolling grade dips. The switchback will also be redesigned to allow for proper drainage. Drainages will need to be maintained at a more intense interval given the soil types and lack of canopy in the area.

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
268.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Change/Recommendation	Connect L-02 to L-01 to make a loop and add another trail if necessary	See Master Response #7. Loop opportunities would be available with the implementation of L-01 and L-02. The RTMP calls for limited trail development in this zone to minimize habitat fragmentation.
269.	N/A	Lawndale Zone	Change/Recommendation	L-02 connector from Quarry to Lawndale. S/B bike only as existing. Hike only from abrupt turn.	See Master Response #7. State Parks was unable to understand the context of this comment. Please send further clarification to trails@parks.ca.gov.
Public Meeting #2 Comment Cards					
270.	Paul Shigley	Lawndale Zone	Support	I am pleased with the ambitious plan. I endorse trailhead improvements at Lawndale - water and restrooms especially.	See Master Response #1.
271.	Paul Shigley	Cobblestone Zone	Support	I agree with 1-way bike travel on Spring Creek Trail. I'm happy to see the emphasis on rebuilding or re-rerouting badly eroded trails.	See Master Response #1.
272.	Paul Shigley	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	A related matter: E-bike prohibitions need to be enforced to minimize trail destruction and sensitive resource impacts. Separating mountain bike uses from other uses is an excellent idea wherever possible. The park is big enough for everyone.	See Master Responses #2, #15, and #17.
273.	Michael Redhorse	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	This is the first meeting I have attended on this subject and I am a little disappointed. There is a stunning lack of discreet horse and bike trails. In my opinion, it would benefit everyone's safety to give bikers and horseback riders more options to avoid cyclists. As a local horse shoer, many of my clients have concerns about their safety and their horses safety when encountering bikers. Often times these women will tell me of close calls of bikers running into their horse and even being verbally aggressive towards them if encountered on a trail. I would imagine a similar risk might exist for hikers enjoying trails. My clients are often so concerned or anxious about the possibility of an incident occurring between themselves/horse that they simply will not ride a trail at all with their horse	See Master Responses #3 and #15.
274.	Diane Wikse	Parkwide	Support	I hike in Annadel twice a week. I came to the first presentation & reviewed this plan online. (I also went to Trail House presentation) I am very impressed with the plan & with this process! You've really listened to input from the community. Thank you. What a GEM we have here - the park & its future looks bright.	Master Response #1.
Comment Letters					
275.	Michael Anzalone, California Mountain Biking Coalition	Richardson Zone	Change/Recommendation	Additionally, regarding "Two Quarry Trail", we respectfully request that all legal avenues be exhausted prior to moving forward with the Trail to Road conversion. The reasons for this are numerous, but primarily the anticipated high cost of this conversion, given the steep slopes and weak, erodible soils on the upper half of the trail. We feel this funding would be better utilized elsewhere for the Park's other RTMP projects.	See Master Responses #16 and #17.
276.	Kelsey Cody	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	Finally, in order to protect the trail system you intend to construct, you should strongly consider banning wheeled and equestrian uses during wet weather and wet trail conditions, when erosion is most severe and trail damage is most likely. Due to the lack of monitoring and enforcement in the past, this outright ban would make monitoring very simple: anyone not on foot should not be in the park. This model has worked very well in other open space settings to protect the trail system's integrity, the experience of visitors, and natural resources.	An RTMP parkwide recommendation will be added to educate trail users regarding the impacts of trail use during wet weather conditions as well as providing a list of trails more and less suitable for use during wet weather conditions. Given the volume of access points into TASP and associated enforcement difficulties, a ban on use of trails during wet weather conditions is not included in the plan recommendations.
277.	Michael Anzalone, California Mountain Biking Coalition	Parkwide	Support	Full Endorsement of Redwood Trails Alliance (RTA) Recommendations: CAMTB has closely reviewed the input provided by CAMTB coalition member, the Redwood Trails Alliance (RTA), in their letter "RE: Input on the Trione-Annadel State Park draft Road and Trails Management Plan." We wish to state clearly that CAMTB fully supports all of the recommendations and positions set forth in the RTA comment letter. We agree that the draft reflects an appropriately modern vision that balances high-quality recreation with the vital protection of the park's landscapes, wildlife, and history. Specifically, we join RTA in supporting: • Strategic Spatial Layering: The "east-west" logic that focuses recreation density in the western "Frontcountry" while preserving the rugged, remote "Backcountry" character of the eastern side.	See Master Response #1.



Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
278.	Michael Anzalone, California Mountain Biking Coalition	Parkwide	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Non-System Trail Integration: The adoption of non-system trails to provide sustainable connectivity and a greater diversity of experiences for all visitors. 	See Master Response #1.
279.	Michael Anzalone, California Mountain Biking Coalition	Parkwide	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure & Amenities: The addition of water stations, improved wayfinding, and modernized trailhead infrastructure to encourage sustainable exploration. 	See Master Response #1.
280.	Michael Anzalone, California Mountain Biking Coalition	Parkwide	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road-to-Trail Conversions: The pragmatic conversion of segments on Two Quarry (R-11) and Marsh Trail (B-06), which will improve public safety, emergency responder access, and fuels management. 	See Master Response #1.
281.	Michael Anzalone, California Mountain Biking Coalition	Parkwide	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable Funding: The establishment of a trail user fee, provided the funds remain within Trione-Annadel to directly support the local trail network 	See Master Response #18.
282.	Michael Anzalone, California Mountain Biking Coalition	Parkwide	Support	<p>Elevating Outdoor Recreation as a Vital Resource: A core priority for CAMTB is to see outdoor recreation resources recognized, valued, and protected with the same level of commitment that states apply to natural and cultural resources. This RTMP is a significant milestone because it treats the trail network as a vital asset for public health, safety, and community well-being. For the cycling community, the inclusion of "Bike-Optimized Trail Opportunity Areas" is essential. By acknowledging robust usage patterns and applying modern design standards, State Parks can improve trail sustainability while proactively reducing user conflicts. This type of modernization is essential for the enjoyment and safety of everyone who utilizes our public lands.</p>	See Master Response # 1
283.	Michael Anzalone, California Mountain Biking Coalition	Parkwide	Support	<p>A Model for California's Public Lands: We believe the Trione-Annadel RTMP serves as a critical model for subsequent RTMP plans in other State Parks and sends a vital message to federal, state, and local agencies across California. The modernization of use policies and recreational resources is not just about convenience; it is a necessity for the well-being of our citizens and the effective management of our landscapes. We strongly encourage the prompt adoption of this plan so that the community members there, including the Redwood Trails Association, can support Parks in its implementation.</p>	See Master Response #4 for a response related to setting a model or precedence with the RTMP.
284.	Matt Baffert, Erik Hillard, and Rob Petterson, Lowelifes Respectable Citizens Club	Parkwide	Support	<p>Full Endorsement of Redwood Trails Alliance (RTA) Recommendations: We have reviewed the input provided by our fellow CAMTB member, the Redwood Trails Alliance (RTA), in their letter, "RE: Input on the Trione-Annadel State Park draft Road and Trails Management Plan". Lowelifes Respectable Citizens' Club fully supports all recommendations and positions made in the RTA comment letter. Specifically, we join RTA in supporting the following key elements of the plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Spatial Layering: The "east-west" logic that concentrates recreation in the "Frontcountry" while preserving "Backcountry" character. 	See Master Response #1.
285.	Matt Baffert, Erik Hillard, and Rob Petterson, Lowelifes Respectable Citizens Club	Parkwide	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • System Trail Integration: The adoption of non-system trails to provide sustainable connectivity and a diversity of trail experiences. 	See Master Response #11.
286.	Matt Baffert, Erik Hillard, and Rob Petterson, Lowelifes Respectable Citizens Club	Parkwide	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure Modernization: Improvements to wayfinding, water stations, and trailhead infrastructure. 	See Master Response #1.

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
287.	Matt Baffert, Erik Hillard, and Rob Petterson, Lowelifes Respectable Citizens Club	Parkwide	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pragmatic Road-to-Trail Conversions: The conversion of segments on Two Quarry and Marsh Trails to improve public safety, emergency access, and fuels management. 	See Master Response #1.
288.	Matt Baffert, Erik Hillard, and Rob Petterson, Lowelifes Respectable Citizens Club	Parkwide	Support	<p>An Evolutionary Step for California State Parks: We view this RTMP as an important evolutionary step for CASP. By including "Bike-Optimized Trail Opportunity Areas," the plan acknowledges modern usage patterns and uses professional design to improve sustainability while reducing user-group conflicts. It is our firm belief that outdoor recreation resources should be recognized, valued, and protected with the same priority as natural and cultural resources. This plan treats the trail network as a vital asset for public health and community safety.</p>	See Master Response #4.
289.	Matt Baffert, Erik Hillard, and Rob Petterson, Lowelifes Respectable Citizens Club	Parkwide	Support	<p>Positive Ripple Effects: The adoption of this RTMP will have positive ripple effects that we expect to feel in our own community. This plan serves as a model for how other State Park units can modernize use policies to reflect contemporary needs. It sends a clear message to federal, state, and local agencies that modernizing recreational resources is essential for the well-being and safety of all public land users. We strongly encourage the prompt adoption of this plan so that the community members there, including the Redwood Trails Association, can support Parks in its implementation.</p>	See Master Response #4 for a response to setting a model or precedence with the RTMP.
290.	Scott Bartlebaugh, Bicycle Trails Council of East Bay	Parkwide	Support	<p>Full Endorsement of Redwood Trails Alliance (RTA) Recommendations: We have reviewed the input provided by our fellow CAMTB member, the Redwood Trails Alliance (RTA), in their letter, "RE: Input on the Trione-Annadel State Park draft Road and Trails Management Plan". [Your Organization Name] fully supports all recommendations and positions made in the RTA comment letter. We agree that the draft represents a sophisticated vision that balances high-quality recreation with the vital protection of the park's natural and cultural resources. Specifically, we join RTA in supporting the following key elements of the plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategic Spatial Layering: The "east-west" logic that concentrates recreation in the "Frontcountry" while preserving "Backcountry" character. 	See Master Response #1.
291.	Scott Bartlebaugh, Bicycle Trails Council of East Bay	Parkwide	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> System Trail Integration: The adoption of non-system trails to provide sustainable connectivity and a diversity of trail experiences. 	See Master Response #11.
292.	Scott Bartlebaugh, Bicycle Trails Council of East Bay	Parkwide	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure Modernization: Improvements to wayfinding, water stations, and trailhead infrastructure. 	See Master Response #1.
293.	Scott Bartlebaugh, Bicycle Trails Council of East Bay	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pragmatic Road-to-Trail Conversions: The conversion of segments on Two Quarry and Marsh Trails to improve public safety, emergency access, and fuels management. 	See Master Response #1.
294.	Scott Bartlebaugh, Bicycle Trails Council of East Bay	Parkwide	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainable Funding: The establishment of a trail user fee, provided funds remain within the park to support the trail network. 	See Master Response #18.
295.	Scott Bartlebaugh, Bicycle Trails Council of East Bay	Parkwide	Support	<p>An Evolutionary Step for California State Parks: We view this RTMP as an important evolutionary step for CASP. By including "Bike-Optimized Trail Opportunity Areas," the plan acknowledges modern usage patterns and uses professional design to improve sustainability while reducing user-group conflicts. It is our firm belief that outdoor recreation resources should be recognized, valued, and protected with the same priority as natural and cultural resources. This plan treats the trail network as a vital asset for public health and community safety.</p>	See Master Response #4.



Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
296.	Scott Bartlebaugh, Bicycle Trails Council of East Bay	Parkwide	Support	<p>Positive Ripple Effects: The adoption of this RTMP will have positive ripple effects that we expect to feel in our own community. This plan serves as a model for how other State Park units can modernize use policies to reflect contemporary needs. It sends a clear message to federal, state, and local agencies that modernizing recreational resources is essential for the well-being and safety of all public land users.</p> <p>We strongly encourage the prompt adoption of this plan so that the community members there, including the Redwood Trails Association, can support Parks in its implementation.</p>	See Master Response #1.
297.	Neil Davis, Ukiah Valley Trail Group	Parkwide	Support	<p>Full Endorsement of Redwood Trails Alliance (RTA) Recommendations: We have reviewed the input provided by our fellow CAMTB member, the Redwood Trails Alliance (RTA), in their letter, "RE: Input on the Trione-Annadel State Park draft Road and Trails Management Plan". [Your Organization Name] fully supports all recommendations and positions made in the RTA comment letter. We agree that the draft represents a sophisticated vision that balances high-quality recreation with the vital protection of the park's natural and cultural resources.</p> <p>Specifically, we join RTA in supporting the following key elements of the plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Spatial Layering: The "east-west" logic that concentrates recreation in the "Frontcountry" while preserving "Backcountry" character 	See Master Response #1.
298.	Neil Davis, Ukiah Valley Trail Group	Parkwide	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • System Trail Integration: The adoption of non-system trails to provide sustainable connectivity and a diversity of trail experiences. 	See Master Response #11.
299.	Neil Davis, Ukiah Valley Trail Group	Parkwide	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure Modernization: Improvements to wayfinding, water stations, and trailhead infrastructure. 	See Master Response #1.
300.	Neil Davis, Ukiah Valley Trail Group	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pragmatic Road-to-Trail Conversions: The conversion of segments on Two Quarry and Marsh Trails to improve public safety, emergency access, and fuels management. 	See Master Response #1.
301.	Neil Davis, Ukiah Valley Trail Group	Parkwide	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable Funding: The establishment of a trail user fee, provided funds remain within the park to support the trail network. 	See Master Response #18.
302.	Neil Davis, Ukiah Valley Trail Group	Parkwide	Support	<p>An Evolutionary Step for California State Parks: We view this RTMP as an important evolutionary step for CASP. By including "Bike-Optimized Trail Opportunity Areas," the plan acknowledges modern usage patterns and uses professional design to improve sustainability while reducing user-group conflicts. It is our firm belief that outdoor recreation resources should be recognized, valued, and protected with the same priority as natural and cultural resources. This plan treats the trail network as a vital asset for public health and community safety.</p>	See Master Response #4.
303.	Neil Davis, Ukiah Valley Trail Group	Parkwide	Support	<p>Positive Ripple Effects: The adoption of this RTMP will have positive ripple effects that we expect to feel in our own community. This plan serves as a model for how other State Park units can modernize use policies to reflect contemporary needs. It sends a clear message to federal, state, and local agencies that modernizing recreational resources is essential for the well-being and safety of all public land users.</p> <p>We strongly encourage the prompt adoption of this plan so that the community members there, including the Redwood Trails Association, can support Parks in its implementation.</p>	See Master Response #1.
304.	Kelsey Cody	Parkwide	Change/Recommendation	<p>I support the overall goals of the Plan to improve natural resource protection, trail safety and sustainability, and visitor experience. However, I am disappointed that the plan appears to favor visitor experience, particularly the experience of a select few, relatively wealthy, almost exclusively white male mountain bikers, over the protection of flora and fauna and other visitors.</p>	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, and #11.

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
305.	Kelsey Cody	Parkwide	Do Not Support	<p>I am especially concerned that the Plan brings a tremendous number of non-system (or as we used to call them, illegal) trails into the legal trail system, particularly those trails that now fragment once continuously uninterrupted habitat in the Richardson and Lawdale zones. These trails should all be decommissioned to preserve uninterrupted habitat, water quality, and other natural and cultural resource values.</p> <p>I am further concerned that illegal trails proposed for legalization in the Cobblestone Zone disrupt watercourses and sensitive wetland habitats, e.g. Wildcat, the southern Rough Go to Rough Go connector, and especially the creek crossing at the outlet of False Lake Meadow. These trails unreasonably impact important Beneficial Uses of Waters of the State defined in the North Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board’s Basin Plan, such as Cold and Warm Freshwater Habitat, Wildlife Habitat, Water Quality Enhancement, and Wetland Habitat.</p> <p>By bringing these illegal trails into the legal trail system, State Parks is furthering a slippery slope that began decades ago. Twenty to thirty years from now, we will be right back here, developing a revised Plan and legalizing ever more illegal trails, further fragmenting habitat and polluting Waters of the State. The thrill seeking of a select few, relatively wealthy, almost exclusively white male mountain bikers will not be sated by the current plan.</p>	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, and #11.
306.	Kelsey Cody	Parkwide	Do Not Support	<p>Unless enforcement is undertaken against violators, they will continue to flaunt state law, State Park Policy, common sense, and open space ethics by maintaining existing illegal trails and constructing new illegal trails. We know this because this has been their behavior for over two decades. In my own peer reviewed academic research, maintaining a public resource requires active and ongoing monitoring and enforcement to prevent its degradation. Throughout the Plan, monitoring and enforcement of the trail system uses is not acknowledged or emphasized sufficiently. The state of Annadel’s trail network at the present is due first and foremost to a lack of monitoring and enforcement. Without the credible threat of detection and punishment, this group of a select few, relatively wealthy, almost exclusively white male mountain bikers will continue to assail the resources of this very special place.</p>	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, #8 #11, #15, and #17.
307.	Kelsey Cody	Parkwide	Do Not Support	<p>The inclusion of “bike-optimized” trails, especially those that will inevitably cause this group of a select few, relatively wealthy, almost exclusively white male mountain bikers to exceed the 15 miles per hour speed limit and create unnecessary danger, is an idea that will only embolden this group of a select few, relatively wealthy, almost exclusively white male mountain bikers to demand, and illegally create, more dangerous and illegal trails. Although this letter does not address safety in depth, it suffices to say here that “bike-optimized” is another way of saying “dangerous for nonwheeled visitors” (to say nothing of motorized vehicles, including e-bikes and motocross bikes, I have seen in the park frequently). If this group of a select few, relatively wealthy, almost exclusively white male mountain bikers wants high speed, flowing, and/or technical trails, they can turn to lobby the County of Sonoma or City of Santa Rosa, which control the adjacent Spring Lake and Howarth Parks, respectively, which have a focus on recreation rather than natural resource protection. As a state park, Annadel’s first priority should be the preservation of open spaces, natural habitats, and the quiet enjoyment of nature. State parks should not cater to the thrill seeking of a select few, relatively wealthy, almost exclusively white male mountain bikers.</p>	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, and #15.



Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
308.	Redwood Trails Alliance	Parkwide	Support	<p>Redwood Trails Alliance supports the RTMP as-is. We believe the draft reflects a sophisticated vision that balances high-quality recreation with the vital protection of the park's landscapes, wildlife, cultural resources, and history.</p> <p>1. Strategic Spatial Layering and Parkwide Balance</p> <p>The plan represents a thoughtful balance of additional access and varied trail experiences. We particularly value the "east-west" logic applied to the park:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frontcountry Focus: Focusing higher-density recreation in historically more disturbed areas closer to population centers along the park's western side allows for more robust infrastructure where it is used and needed most. • Backcountry Character: We support the "backcountry" approach maintained on the eastern side of the park. Leaving this area less developed preserves the rugged, remote character that many visitors seek, and helps protect its unique natural resources. 	See Master Response #1.
309.	Redwood Trails Alliance	Parkwide	Support	<p>We also appreciate the way the Plan balances and distributes different trail experiences throughout the Park. The inclusion of "Bike-Optimized Trail Opportunity Areas" in areas that already experience robust usage by cyclists is a thoughtful strategy that will improve the sustainability of the park's existing trail network while reducing the risk of conflicts between user groups.</p>	See Master Response #4.
310.	Redwood Trails Alliance	Parkwide	Support	<p>The Plan's adoption of numerous non-system trails recognizes how these features provide sustainable connectivity between system trails, increase the diversity of trail experiences within the park, and make shorter and longer loop options available to a broader range of park visitors.</p>	See Master Response #11.
311.	Redwood Trails Alliance	Parkwide	Support	<p>2. Enhanced Amenities and Modern Recreation</p> <p>We strongly support the proposed amenities, including additional water stations, improved wayfinding and signage, and new trailhead infrastructure. These additions modernize the park experience and encourage sustainable exploration. By providing these resources, State Parks is acknowledging the evolving needs of the recreation community while keeping the footprint manageable.</p>	See Master Response #1.
312.	Redwood Trails Alliance	Parkwide	Support	<p>3. Pragmatic Infrastructure: Road-to-Trail Conversions</p> <p>We are aware that some visitors have questioned the need for and cost of the proposed trail-to-road conversions for segments of Two Quarry Trail (R-11) and Marsh Trail (B-06). RTA supports these actions for several reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ease of Restoration: These segments already possess a "road prism" from their history as unpaved roads, making restoration more straightforward than new construction. • Human-Scale Design: We appreciate that these segments will be restored to a one-way traffic standard, maintaining a "multi-use trail feel" rather than becoming wide fire roads. • Public Safety and Emergency Access: The remote, rugged nature of the park's eastern backcountry limits access by EMTs, firefighters, and other emergency responders. The proposed conversions will improve emergency access and create opportunities for more effective fuels management in a fire-prone landscape. • Maintenance & Volunteerism: These corridors are vital for moving equipment to remote areas. Improved access ensures that RTA and other volunteer groups and contractors can perform restoration work more efficiently and cost-effectively. 	See Master Response #1.

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
313.	Redwood Trails Alliance	Parkwide	Support	<p>4. Funding the Future: Support for Park Fees</p> <p>We acknowledge that these enhancements—and the long-term health of the park—require sustainable funding. Redwood Trails Alliance supports the establishment of a trail user fee, provided that the funds collected remain within Trione-Annadel. We note that as an example, the nonprofit Friends of China Camp has successfully implemented a similar program at that state park for years. We are prepared to act as a resource to help educate the public on the immense benefits of a day-use or annual fee, ensuring visitors understand that their contribution directly supports the trails and landscapes they love.</p>	See Master Response #18.
314.	Redwood Trails Alliance	Parkwide	Support	<p>A Model for California State Parks</p> <p>By working together—State Park staff, stakeholder groups like RTA, our partner organization Friends of Trione-Annadel, and the thousands of visitors who want to give back—we are confident in a successful outcome. We believe the implementation of this RTMP can serve as a model for other State Park units across California on how to balance modern recreation, public safety, and effective landscape-scale conservation.</p> <p>While we encourage the public to engage and offer suggestions, our primary hope is that this plan is adopted soon. The community is ready to get to work. The sooner this plan is finalized, the sooner we can begin the implementation and stewardship that will benefit Trione-Annadel for generations.</p>	See Master Response #4 for a response to setting a model or precedence with the RTMP.
315.	Nathan Knudsen, Redding Trail Alliance	Parkwide	Support	<p>Full Endorsement of Redwood Trails Alliance (RTA) Recommendations</p> <p>We have reviewed the input provided by our fellow CAMTB member, the Redwood Trails Alliance (RTA), in their letter, "RE: Input on the Trione-Annadel State Park draft Road and Trails Management Plan". Redding Trail Alliance fully supports all recommendations and positions made in the RTA comment letter. We agree that the draft represents a sophisticated vision that balances high-quality recreation with the vital protection of the park's natural and cultural resources. Specifically, we join RTA in supporting the following key elements of the plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Spatial Layering: The "east-west" logic that concentrates recreation in the "Frontcountry" while preserving "Backcountry" character 	See Master Response #1.
316.	Nathan Knudsen, Redding Trail Alliance	Parkwide	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • System Trail Integration: The adoption of non-system trails to provide sustainable connectivity and a diversity of trail experiences. 	See Master Response #1.
317.	Nathan Knudsen, Redding Trail Alliance	Parkwide	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure Modernization: Improvements to wayfinding, water stations, and trailhead infrastructure. 	See Master Response #1.
318.	Nathan Knudsen, Redding Trail Alliance	Parkwide	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pragmatic Road-to-Trail Conversions: The conversion of segments on Two Quarry and Marsh Trails to improve public safety, emergency access, and fuels management. 	See Master Response #1.
319.	Nathan Knudsen, Redding Trail Alliance	Parkwide	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainable Funding: The establishment of a trail user fee, provided funds remain within the park to support the trail network. 	See Master Response #18
320.	Nathan Knudsen, Redding Trail Alliance	Parkwide	Support	<p>An Evolutionary Step for California State Parks:</p> <p>We view this RTMP as an important evolutionary step for CASP. By including "Bike-Optimized Trail Opportunity Areas," the plan acknowledges modern usage patterns and uses professional design to improve sustainability while reducing user-group conflicts. It is our firm belief that outdoor recreation resources should be recognized, valued, and protected with the same priority as natural and cultural resources. This plan treats the trail network as a vital asset for public health and community safety.</p>	See Master Response #4



Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
321.	Nathan Knudsen, Redding Trail Alliance	Parkwide	Support	Positive Ripple Effects: The adoption of this RTMP will have positive ripple effects that we expect to feel in our own community. This plan serves as a model for how other State Park units can modernize use policies to reflect contemporary needs. It sends a clear message to federal, state, and local agencies that modernizing recreational resources is essential for the well-being and safety of all public land users. We strongly encourage the prompt adoption of this plan so that the community members there, including the Redwood Trails Association, can support Parks in its implementation.	See Master Response #1.
322.	Sebastian Cinquini	Parkwide	Support	I am happy to see there are plans for resources and amenities such as water and restrooms. I also think that some of the updated trail plans are great and are adding more fun trails to the list of things to do.	See Master Response #1.
323.	Sebastian Cinquini	Parkwide	Do Not Support	Going back to what I am concerned about, I think camping is a bad idea, for a couple of reasons. Reason one is that camping is messy. People aren't always the best stewards of trails and parks, and a lot of them litter, leading to the park being less of a nice place for others. Reason two is night. I know that you don't want people in the park at night, considering that the gates are open from sunrise to sunset, and that's fine with me. However, if people camp inside the park, there would be more of a likelihood of people hiking and/or riding in the park at night.	Camping was proposed as a potential opportunity for evaluation as part of Chapter 5 of the RTMP but was not forwarded as a recommendation. Camping is not recommended in the RTMP.
324.	Sebastian Cinquini	Cobblestone Zone	Change/Recommendation	My second concern is Spring Creek Trail. As an avid mountain biker, not being able to go down a trail that I absolutely love seems unfair. Not being able to ride down Spring Creek at all times is specifically the part that I dislike. I've ridden it many times, and for me, it's become a quick trail to have fun on. There are no other trails in Annadel that give the same sensation as riding down Spring Creek. I have one idea on how this could be fixed. You could have Spring Creek closed downhill to bikers on weekends, as those are the days that Spring Creek receives the most traffic, and you could have it open downhill to bikers on weekdays. However, I would like Spring Creek to stay open to everyone on all days. I think the major problem here is that most bikers don't know enough trail etiquette for hikers. I am a member of a local biking team and the coaches teach great trail etiquette. One of the major things they stress on is how to make hikers aware that you are there. I feel that more bikers need to learn how to do this safely. I am looking forward to a response, so feel free to write me back.	See Master Responses #15 and 17. The RTMP will revise parkwide recommendation P-20 to include educating users on trail rules and etiquette.
Social Pinpoint Comments					
325.	Marilyn	Plan Recommendations Map	Change/Recommendation	Please consider access point for Wi-Fi in case someone is lost so they are aware this area will have a good signal for communications plus an outlet for charging phones for emergency purposes	Internet access is currently provided at the TASP Visitor Center area. Additional Wi-Fi access and cell phone charging will be added as a consideration under Recommendation P-25: Trail Amenities. Although TASP is not a designated wilderness, many who visit enjoy the backcountry feeling the park provides. This would be taken into consideration when evaluating the installation of such facilities.
326.	Bob	Plan Recommendations Map	Change/Recommendation	Equestrian trails need to have signage designating they have the right away. E bikes and mountain bikes are riding too fast and not staying on trails (which causes erosion). The bikers upset the horses and do not appear to care. In one of my rides, when I politely said they need to respect the trail, the response was "we know where your trailers are parked".	See Master Response #6, #15, and #17. Language addressing education regarding trail rules and etiquette will be added to Recommendation P-20.
327.	Hailey C	Plan Recommendations Map	Change/Recommendation	Add, an ADA/beginner friendly, double track trail with plenty of switchbacks to reduce grade. This would parallel Canyon and take users up to lake level. Intention would be to make the park more equitable for more user types and skill levels.	See Master Response #9. Given the steep terrain and associated resources impacts that would be unavoidable with aligning an ADA or accessible trail through this area, State Parks does not consider this to be a reasonably feasible recommendation.
328.	N/A	N/A	Change/Recommendation	Would love hours on some trails.like Spring creek where no bikes allowed..also good that bikers have bells to alert hikers..we are older and dont hear without alerts vocal is best really...also when you closed Spring c to make it narrower ..it just returned to wide path.so that was wasted effort..please dont do that in future..	See Master Response #17. The Spring Creek Trail narrowing mentioned in the comment was part of a previous road-to-trail project conducted in the early 2000s. State Parks recognizes that steep slopes, rock terrain, and lack of maintenance has caused a rewidening of the trail.

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
329.	Leslie	N/A	Change/Recommendation	Spring Creek trail is one of the most enjoyable trails in the park for riding a bike down, and it is not incredibly technical so can be enjoyed by a wide range of user abilities. It would be a big disappointment both to riders new to the sport and those more experienced to lose access to Spring Creek downhill. I suggest scheduled user days—give mountain bikers one, two or three specific days each week they can ride this trail. I have seen this work in other trail networks. Please don't close this trail to downhill riders altogether!	See Master Responses #15 and #17.
330.	N/A	N/A	Change/Recommendation	I'm a little confused on where to comment, so I'll just leave a few here. I am a long-time frequent hiker at Annadel. I think this TASP project is amazing in its scope and detail. Thanks for all of your hard work! I am going to miss a few of my "non-system route" trails, but I understand the need to curtail some of them. I wish to put in a plea to save the route from the end of Steve's S. heading straight to the lake, instead of doubling back to Richardson. When you're walking those extra steps can feel burdensome. That trail is the only "hiking only" trail. Why not extend it a little?!	See Master Response #11. The location referenced was evaluated as part of the non-system route evaluation process. See the Trione-Annadel State Park Non-System Route Evaluation Explorer available through the TASP RTMP webpage here www.parks.ca.gov/TASPRTMP for additional details. State Parks acknowledges that these non-system routes provide a desirable alternative to the Warren Richardson Trail; however, the flat meadow landscape and associated sensitive natural resources present significant constraints. In particular, these conditions are not well-suited to sustainable trail development without substantial investment, and associated maintenance requirements, in trail structures such as boardwalks, causeways, turnpikes, or other protective features designed to minimize impacts.
331.	Susan	Plan Recommendations Map	Do Not Support	[Referring to Two Quarry Trail] Please do not turn this into a fire road. The rocky nature of the trail means a sensitive eco system is here	See Master Responses #16 and #17. While State Parks recognizes that certain areas of the park contain sensitive natural resources, this particular location has not been identified as a uniquely sensitive area from a resource management or geological standpoint. Much of the park is characterized by naturally rocky conditions, and the presence of rocky terrain alone does not necessarily indicate heightened sensitivity or preclude consideration for this type of project. As with all proposed projects, site-specific evaluations are conducted to assess potential impacts to natural and cultural resources. If implementation moves forward, appropriate measures would be incorporated to avoid or minimize resource disturbance and ensure the project is consistent with State Parks' resource protection standards.
332.	Nathan	Plan Recommendations Map	Do Not Support	Converting Two Quarry trail to a fire road seems hasty and irresponsible given the level of natural beauty, plant diversity, and creek along the corridor. Will it even be practical for large fire trucks to enter the park that route? It seems that white oak entrance is much more practical and would save a lot of money and avoid significant degradation of the park.	See Master Responses #16 and #17.
333.	Terrie	N/A	Change/Recommendation	Add trail from bench to oakmont by pond and pool	See Master Response #11. The non-system route from the picnic table at Lawndale Trail to the Oakmont East Recreation Center was evaluated. This evaluation determined that the existing route was not sustainable along with potential resource concerns with a trail in this location. In addition, there were concerns over the community's response to providing access to this location within the private Oakmont Community. For these reasons, adoption of a trail alignment in this area did not become an RTMP recommendation. State Parks will further evaluate this location prior to the next update to the RTMP.
334.	Jane Kennedy	Plan Recommendations Map	Change/Recommendation	Concern that bikes on the steep part of Riolyte trail will cause further erosion. With new proposed trails I do not see a lot that are for hiking only - many of us using Annadel are seniors and it is not safe to be on narrow trails with bikers. What are you doing to address this issue? Thank you.	See Master Response #15. Rhyolite Trail would be modified per recommendations in the change-in-use evaluation (Appendix 5) to improve trail sustainability and address potential safety concerns prior to the addition of bicycles.
335.	James	N/A	Change/Recommendation	Please post more three way yield signs on multiple use trails	See Master Response #6. RTMP Recommendation P-24 will be modified to include this type of sign.



Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
336.	N/A	N/A	Change/Recommendation	Many, many years ago I hiked Schulz canyon up from the bottom and found that there seems to be 2 waterfalls, but I was never sure. From the bottom there was no safe way up the canyon walls around the first waterfall. I also saw some type of giant salamander in pool of first waterfall. Also there is a spring and was remains of a log cabin. It was not safe to hike up the creek, so have not done it in many years. I used to regularly walk from Ledson marsh out flow to see the upper Schultz falls. It was very fun to see in the wet season. It would be great if you put in a real trail to the overlook.	See Master Response #7. State Parks was unable to locate or determine the prior existence of this route. It is believed to be in Schultz Canyon, which is a location the RTMP does not want to further fragment with trails. Please send any additional information you might have on the waterfall trail location to trails@parks.ca.gov.
337.	KPH	Plan Recommendations Map	Support	Highly support this entire bike optimized zone. The Increased trail maintenance would greatly benefit the community of mountain bikers.	See Master Response #1.
338.	I ride Ebikes	Plan Recommendations Map	Change/Recommendation	Would like to see language addressing ebikes and their allowed usage in the park.	See Master Response #2.
339.	Bob	Plan Recommendations Map	Change/Recommendation	Bikers are not paying for parking or entry fees to the park and there is not any authority to hold them accountable for paying. Park rangers need the authority to give tickets for misuse of the park.	See Master Responses #17 and #18.
340.	James	Plan Recommendations Map	Change/Recommendation	I do believe that the modern electrical bicycles are not much different than allowing motorcycles expect for noise. The way they run up and down the trails at full speed is very unsafe for hikers and equestrians and even other cyclists . It would be great to see the rangers have the ability to write tickets.	See Master Responses #2 and #17.
341.	James	Plan Recommendations Map	Change/Recommendation	Please keep equestrian trails accessible. We ride up here much more than the equestrian tally shows .	See Master Responses #3 and #15.
342.	KPH	Plan Recommendations Map	Support	I wholly support park fees that would allocate funds towards not only bike optimized zones but all other use areas to benefit all Sonoma county residents and visitors.	See Master Response #18.
343.	N/A	N/A	Support	Riding Annadel on my mountain bike with my sons is one of the best parts of living in Santa Rosa! Would love the opportunity to enjoy and help grow the trail system!	See Master Response #1.
344.	RiverGal55	Plan Recommendations Map	Support	General comment: I appreciate how inclusive the park has been in soliciting input from park users. I've hiked and biked in Annadel for more than 10 years. The park's endured a lot from its human visitors and well as challenges presented by Mother Nature. Thanks for allowing us to contribute and work with you to create a better Annadel for all of its users.	See Master Response #1.
345.	Travis, Repack Racing	N/A	Change/Recommendation	Hello! So great to see all the amazing work going into this plan. This is Travis from Repack Racing. We inquired in 2024 about reviving a mountain bike race at Annadel. There is a very high demand and it's one of the venues most requested by our riders. I noticed the section P-21 Organized Events which is very encouraging. I am wondering if competitive events specifically have been discussed as part of the plan? I know it would be a very welcome use of the park for the MTB segment of users. Thank you! -Travis	It is outside the scope of RTMP to recommend specific special events, but RTMP Recommendation P-21 includes consideration of hosting additional organized events within the park with associated resource monitoring. This opens the door for further consultation and coordination with park and Bay Area District State Parks staff on specific special events.
346.	N/A	N/A	Change/Recommendation	It seems to me that trails that get regular leaf litter, debris from redwood trees, seem to last longer than trails out in open. It appears that dirt is actually being created. Not sure if you could use chipped wood products from tree services to maintain them? It may not be actually happening, may be because of slope also. Anyway, thanks for gravel too.	Tree canopy and associated leaf litter play a significant role in trail sustainability. However, the use of imported wood chips is not considered a long-term or practical solution, as it would require ongoing importation and maintenance. Additionally, wood chips are easily displaced from the trail surface through regular use and rainfall. Shading from the tree canopy helps reduce the direct erosive impact of rainfall and maintains soil moisture by limiting sun exposure. In addition, the canopy provides a consistent, natural supply of leaf litter, which protects the trail surface and further aids in moisture retention.
347.	KPH	Plan Recommendations Map	Support	Some of the best biking areas of the park that should see support for improved trail maintenance for safety and fun.	See Master Responses #4, #5, and #14.

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
348.	N/A	N/A	Change/Recommendation	There needs to be areas where no bikes are allowed. That's other than Steve's S trail. If it's not possible to separate hikers from bikers then there needs to be a bell or other noise maker hanging on the bike to let hikers know you're coming from behind. You can't hear them coming from behind and the bikes are going fast down hill.	See Master Response #15. The RTMP calls for new system trails where bicycles are not allowed as part of Recommendations R-05, R-08, and L-02 as well as bicycle uphill only as part of Recommendation C-05. Language relating to a voluntary bicycle bell program will be revised under Recommendation P-25.
349.	James	Plan Recommendations Map	Change/Recommendation	Please keep trails open for equestrians that will enable us to make nice enjoyable rides around the entire park . Post the three way yield right of way signs at appropriate locations or trail junctions . Consider eliminating or limiting electric bicycles usage inside park . Enable park rangers to have some authority to enforce correct trail usage. Hikers, equestrian riders are in danger of out of control speeding from cyclists on trails. Speed limits so that all can safely enjoy the park has to offer. Thank you	See Master Responses #3, #15, and #6.
350.	Roger	N/A	Support	Please allow the continued building and maintaining of mtb specific trails with jumps, berms and drops in this area	See Master Responses #4, #5, #11, and #15. Neither State Parks nor the recommendations in the RTMP support continued unauthorized building of non-system routes and features on existing system roads and trails. The RTMP does propose this area as a bike-optimized zone for future planning, design, and implementation.
351.	Bruce	N/A	Do Not Support	The side trails off Canyon Trail are simply an attempt to appease a group of bikers who unlawfully created these trails. They are generally not used by hikers and equestrians and divide wild lands needlessly. All divisions of this sort destroy areas where wild animals are protected.	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, and #11.
352.	Brian P	N/A	Support	This is fantastic!	See Master Response #1.
353.	Roger	Plan Recommendations Map	Support	[Referring to trail between Cobblestone Trail and Spring Lake Regional Park] This is an excellent trail, Harvester. Please leave it alone and allow the building of more like it	See Master Responses #4, #5, and #11.
354.	Andrew Kleist	N/A	Change/Recommendation	Interpretive cultural marker for the historic foundation and history of the property.	Although the RTMP does not provide exact locations for proposed interpretation it does call for improved visitor stewardship and a signage and wayfinding program under Recommendations P-20 and P-24.
355.	Andrew Kleist	Plan Recommendations Map	Change/Recommendation	Interpretive markers about the lake and site history, including a marker near the historic foundation on the spring creek entrance side	Although it is outside of the scope of the RTMP to located individual signs and markers, Recommendation P-24 calls for interpretive signs at key locations. Specific locations would be determined as part of developing a signage and wayfinding program. Recommendation P-24 will be revised to mention inclusion of interpretive signage in key locations includes those of historic and cultural significance.
356.	Andrew Kleist	N/A	Support	Really like the idea of adding new connections to Spring Lake.	See Master Response #1.
357.	Andrew Kleist	Plan Recommendations Map	Change/Recommendation	Maybe move the trail further from the southern lake edge, tends to get very muddy.	State Parks was unable to identify the reference location. Please send exact location to trails@parks.ca.gov.
358.	bhartsough	Plan Recommendations Map	Change/Recommendation	This new hiking trail between North Burma and Steve's S Trails would be a great addition for those of us who aren't hiking longer distances these days.	See Master Response #1.
359.	Ramjet	N/A	Support	Please allow the continued building and maintaining of mtb specific trails with jumps, berms and drops in this area	See Master Responses #4, #5, #11, and #15. Neither State Parks nor the recommendations in the RTMP support continued unauthorized building of non-system routes and features on existing system trails. The RTMP does propose this area as a bike-optimized zone for future planning, design, and implementation.
360.	Brian P	Plan Recommendations Map	Change/Recommendation	[Referring to Richardson Zone bike-optimized zone] Thank you for the bike optimized area. I would love to see a downhill flow trail here.	See Master Response #1.
361.	Hailey Childress	Plan Recommendations Map	Change/Recommendation	Is there a reroute for Manzanita that could protect sensitive resources while still giving more users access? Can we keep this trail open to hikers and mountain bikers and alternate user days?	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, #11, and #17.



Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
362.	Bruce	N/A	Do Not Support	The maze of unlawful trails off Richardson is truly mind boggling. These trails are mostly post-Covid trails that were cut into a previously undisturbed natural and undisturbed section of the park. Of course the trails are in good condition now but with continued use, they will erode quickly and demand maintenance which is simply not available. This is another attempt to make this park a Bike Park, rather than a state park benefitting all visitors. Legitimizing unlawful trails rewards a group of park destroyers who feel entitled to create their own adventures. Please consider that this park is home to many wild animals who do not seem to have a voice in the park being cut into trails.	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, #11, and #17.
363.	N/A	N/A	Change/Recommendation	I also would like to advocate for an earlier opening of the gate at Channel Drive. 8am seems so late, especially considering all the nearby Regional Parks open at 7am	Daily park operations such as this are outside the scope of an RTMP and are determined by State Parks District operational staff.
364.	Roger	N/A	Support	There's a really fun trail here that should remain for mtb only	See Master Responses #4, #5, #11, and #15. The non-system route mentioned is unsustainable, impacting sensitive resources, and identified for future removal and rehabilitation to a natural condition. See the Trione-Annadel State Park Non-system Route Evaluation Explorer available through the TASP RTMP webpage here www.parks.ca.gov/TASPRTMP for more details.
365.	Brian P	N/A	Support	Fantastic!	See Master Response #1.
366.	Bruce	N/A	Do Not Support	This map is little confusing to me. There has been a trail to the Knob from Marsh Trail for decades, which I have no problem with. I do have trouble with the somewhat newer trail coming up from Canyon trail that skirts along and sometimes into private and easement lands and trails that seem to parallel Marsh trail. Again, these trails don't benefit all users. These are trails that seem to reward those entitled individuals who seem to feel they can do whatever they want to/in the state park. There is no reason to believe that these individuals will stop building trails if the proposed trail package is approved. The enforcement of laws to stop bad behavior is the only deterrent, and there are simply not enough rangers to effectively protect the park.	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, #11, #15, and #17.
367.	KPh	N/A	Change/Recommendation	Top of marsh down to Canyon could use some reoccurring trail maintenance to improve this bike optimized zone.	See Master Response #14.
368.	James	N/A	Change/Recommendation	More trails such as B02 should be equestrian hikers only . Trails that would enable a complete loop of the park for equestrian and hikers . This back trail I usually come across horses or hikers anyways . The park is getting more tore up from off trail bicycles . Park rangers need more authority to help stop this kind of stuff. Safety away from the out of control cyclists would be very nice. Most are considerate but it only takes a couple bad apples . Be great to see more three way yield signs on multiple use trails. Thanks	See Master Response #15. Allowing multi-use on the north slope of Bennett Mountain provides an opportunity for all trail users to enjoy the views and natural resources of this area.
369.	Bruce	N/A	Do Not Support	Lawndale is a nice trail. The trails that have sprung from Rhyolite trail, originally a very short hiker only trail is a colossal free-for-all of bike trails that weave like a spider web throughout the Grey Canyon area, almost all built in the last 5 years, some within the last 6 months. I would be very careful approving trails in this area. It is a difficult area to patrol and this area is rapidly being destroyed. Legitimizing any trails in this area opens the door to further unregulated destruction.	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, #11, #15, and #17. The RTMP is recommending limited future system trails in this zone; mainly utilizing existing non-system routes with modifications as determined during future project-specific design and implementation.
370.	N/A	N/A	Change/Recommendation	I wish to second the comment about adding some parking at the Schultz trailhead.	See Master Response #12.
371.	Bruce	N/A	Do Not Support	S-03 is simply a shortcut trail. That is a poor reason to cut trails in this wild park. The Schultz section otherwise is one of the few undisturbed sections. It's too bad it really has only neighborhood access.	State Parks agrees that, in general, shortcut trails are not desired, but this non-system route does get used as a connection between Ridge and Marsh trails. Recommendation R-03 calls for avoiding resource impacts on the intermittent stream and low-lying terrain by routing the trail to upland locations and/or using elevated structures, such as causeways and drain lenses.
Rutti Comments					
372.	Fred	TOC/List of Figures	Change/Recommendation	Is it possible to monitor bike speeds? If so, that would make hikers feel more safe.	See Master Responses #6 and #17. CCR 4360 states that the Department may establish speed limits for designated trail use for units or portions thereof. If established, these speed limits will be posted.

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
373.	Mr. Wimmer	ES-1	Change/Recommendation	So we have schools who have no access. i propose a gazebo and picnic tables up to 15-20 kids, young adults accommodation for bithday parties, classes, school events or other events .	Amenities such as this could be considered under RTMP Recommendation P-25: Trail Amenities.
374.	Cynthia K	ES-3	Change/Recommendation	When does State Park implement resource protection programs? Hasn't done so adequately for many years, hence the degraded resources due to inadequate design, maintenance, bicyclists going off trail, etc. If State Park had adequately implemented resource protection programs, the Park would not be so degraded. Very difficult to enforce resource protection rules applicable to bicyclists. How does SPs expect to be able to do in the future what it has been unable to do in the past?	See Master Responses #4, #7, #11, and #17. State Parks does implement resource protection programs, and these efforts are actively underway at TASP. The department maintains an ongoing natural resource management program that includes, but is not limited to, annual treatment of invasive plant species, forest health and fuels reduction work, oak woodland restoration, the reintroduction of beneficial fire, wetland enhancement, and monitoring and protection of endangered plant and animal species. While these efforts are substantial, they are carried out within the reality of funding and staffing constraints that affect public land management agencies statewide. As a result, State Parks must continually prioritize and phase work based on available resources, ecological need, and public safety considerations. In addition, State Parks strives to balance resource protection with recreational access. TASP serves a wide range of visitors, and management decisions are made with the goal of protecting natural resources while providing meaningful opportunities for public use and enjoyment.
375.	T Boss	ES-3	Change/Recommendation	[Referring to offering education to manage multi-use trails] Let's learn from equestrians what the preferred routes are, especially from the staging area at the base of Warren-Richardson, and educate the public (cyclists in particular) to be on the watch, slow down, announce their presence and communicate with the rider for direction on passing safely. It could be done through a partnership of stakeholders, including the park partner, bike clubs, running clubs and equestrian orgs.	See Master Responses #6 and #17. State Parks agrees with this comment and is hopeful trail partners can assist in educating trail users on trail rules and proper etiquette. Parkwide recommendation P-20 will be updated to include education on park rules and trail etiquette.
376.	Kasey O'Killion	ES-5	Change/Recommendation	A permanent bike maintenance/aid station would also be a wonderful amenity	This could be considered under RTMP Recommendation P-25: Trail Amenities. Friends of Trione-Annadel and State Parks are already working on providing bike maintenance/aid stations
377.	Lisa L.	ES-6	Change/Recommendation	Based on discussions and questions raised at recent stakeholder meetings, it's clear that the public doesn't understand that there currently is no RTMP implementation plan. A clearer explanation here and in Chapter 6 is warranted re: the intent being solely to inform and guide State Parks management decisions.	See Master Response #8. Additional information on implementation has been added to Chapter 6 of the RTMP.
378.	Bill G.	ES-7, Figure ES-1	Change/Recommendation	"henry's nob"? yikes.	State Parks is using the name that has been most traditionally used to describe this prominent landform in the RTMP. Future name changes would be considered.
379.	Bill G.	ES-7, Figure ES-1	Change/Recommendation	waterfall trail!	See Master Response #7. State Parks was unable to locate or determine the prior existence of this route. It is believed to be in Schultz Canyon, which is a location the RTMP does not want to further fragment with trails. Please send any additional information you might have on the waterfall trail location to trails@parks.ca.gov.
380.	Pete Parkinson	ES-7, Figure ES-1	Change/Recommendation	The EVA shown in Fig ES-1 at this location does not exist and has never existed in the nearly 25 years that I've lived on this property.	RTMP maps will be revised to show correct emergency vehicle access (EVA) and gate locations.
381.	Pete Parkinson	1-5, Figure 1-1	Change/Recommendation	See my comment re Fig ES-1. This Figure is correct.	RTMP maps will be revised to show correct emergency vehicle access and gate locations.
382.	Pete Parkinson	3-11, Figure 3-3	Change/Recommendation	See my comment re Fig ES-1; this Figure 3-3 is correct.	RTMP maps will be revised to show correct emergency vehicle access and gate locations.
383.	Pete Parkinson	3-21, Figure 3-8	Change/Recommendation	See comment re Fig ES-1; this Fig 3-8 is incorrect. There is no EVA and no gate at this location.	RTMP maps will be revised to show correct emergency vehicle access and gate locations.
384.	Lisa L.	3-30	Change/Recommendation	Please add "Enhancing the efficiency of trail maintenance through improved trail maintenance by State Parks, as well as..	See Master Response #14. The State Parks trails program has been added as a need for enhancing the efficiency of trail maintenance at TASP.
385.	Pete Parkinson	3-43, Figure 3-14	Other Park Facilities and Uses	See comment re Fig ES-1; this Fig 3-14 is not correct. There is no EVA and no gate at this location.	RTMP maps will be revised to show correct emergency vehicle access and gate locations.



Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
386.	w	5-5	Change/Recommendation	Another option is to limit which users can use which trails on which days. It's commonly done elsewhere, and doesn't limit people to using only certain sections of the park. In my experience, it's worked out very well, and people are confident that they can safely recreate without other trail users causing safety concerns. It's the best of both worlds.	See Master Response #17.
387.	Brian	5-11	Do Not Support	I oppose limiting bicyclists to uphill only. This trail has clear sight lines and no blind corners or turns. Trail conflicts can be reduced by improving trail conditions as there is plenty of trail width which is narrowed by poor trail maintenance creating pinch points at downed trees, rocks and boulders, land slides debris, etc. narrow the trail	See Master Response #15.
388.	J Bayless	5-19, Figure 5-3, Recommendation R-11	Do Not Support	Two Quarry, as it currently exists, is an important connector, as well as a trail worth preserving as it currently exists because of the array of challenging trail experiences. It is also important to note that the upper 1/3 of Two Quarry *is no longer a logging/quarry road* because of the steep grades and large scale (slide/slump) erosive conditions. In no way is it appropriate to convert Two Quarry to an access road – especially considering there is a paved alternative up from the Oakmont development.	See Master Responses #16 and #17. State Parks believes the upper third of Quarry Trail referred to in this comment was a portion of the road that received a more complete filling of the former road backslope during the road-to-trail conversion completed in the early 2000s and thus displays more of a singletrack trail condition than other portions of the route. State Parks has not noticed large scale slumping or sliding conditions in this location but will reevaluate prior to the release of the Proposed Draft RTMP.
389.	J Bayless	5-19, Figure 5-3, Recommendation R-08	Do Not Support	Given the greatly diminishing use of Annadel by equestrians, it's entirely inappropriate and unnecessary to designate an equestrian-only trail here. To the contrary, this trail, known colloquially as "rainforest" is a very important connector for cyclists, as the alternatives (South Burma and Marsh) are both over-trafficked and poorly maintained. Rainforest is a perfect and necessary alternative – as it currently exists (historically was Steve's Secret Trail), or as suggested & re-routed.	See Master Response #15. Recommendation R-08 calls for a use designation of hike/horse. Previous park maps refer to the former system trail located in this area as "Middle Steve's S Trail."
390.	Herbert Ristock	5-25	Change/Recommendation	Connection to Oakmont is very much appreciated. two comments: (1) Hiking Woodley/Jason's Trail, connecting to Lawndale Trail (this connection exists and is part of the new plan), and returning from Lawndale Trail to EastRec (this connection exists as well, but isn't part of the plan and shall be added) is a pleasant loop especially for people in our part of Oakmont. (2) Opening Woodley/Jason's trail for biking might not be a good idea, because of the huge effort to maintain this well for both hikers and bikers. It is also risky for bikers, because close to the sharp turn it is tempting to take a very steep shortcut, and bikers might hurt themselves when crashing into the creek. When walking the trail, we had the impression that such accidents already happened.	See Master Response #11. The non-system route from the picnic table at Lawndale Trail to the Oakmont East Rec Center was evaluated. This evaluation determined that the existing route was not sustainable along with potential resource concerns with a trail in this location. In addition, there were concerns over the community's response to providing access to this location in within the Oakmont community. For these reasons, this non-system route did not become a RTMP recommendation. State Parks will further evaluate this location prior to the release of the Proposed Draft RTMP. The non-system routes comprising the referred to Woodley/Jason's Trail follow old roadbed in some sections and are unconstructed singletrack in others. In their current state they would not be suitable for hike/bike use. However, this general route location would be reevaluated at time of implementation and would likely require modifications to include reengineering of existing non-system routes as well as reroutes for safety and sustainability. State Parks believes that bike access from the Oakmont community to the multi-use system routes of the Lawndale zone would be a desire by this community.
391.	Pete Parkinson	5-31, Figure 5-6	Change/Recommendation	See comment re Fig ES-1; this Fig 5-6 is not correct. There is no EVA and no gate at this location.	RTMP maps will be revised to show correct emergency vehicle access and gate locations.
392.	Lisa L.	6-1	Change/Recommendation	The Executive Summary states that the intent of the RTMP isn't necessarily to implement all recommendations presented, but to provide publicly reviewed ideas to help guide future park management decisions. This should be emphasized in Chapter 6, "Implementation."	See Master Response #8. This language will also be added to Chapter 6, "Implementation," of the RTMP.
393.	Lisa L.	6-1	Change/Recommendation	Based on discussions and questions raised at recent stakeholder meetings, it's clear that the public doesn't understand that there currently is no RTMP implementation plan. A clearer explanation in Chapter 6 is warranted re: the intent being solely to inform and guide State Parks management decisions.	See Master Response #8. Additional information on implementation has been added to Chapter 6 of the RTMP.

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
394.	N/A	6-3	Change/Recommendation	Based on questions raised at recent stakeholder meetings, the public doesn't understand the implications and timelines for the various levels of environmental documentation/review that will be required for the different categories of plan recommendations. A more robust explanation is warranted re: the categories of projects that would be included in the IS/MND vs. those that would require an EIR, and the timelines for preparation of an IS/MND vs. EIR(s) for those projects. Perhaps this could be done in a Table format.	See Master Response #8.
395.	[Blank Cell]	N/A	Do Not Support	Many bicyclists creating new trails, riding up road and trailside edges and creating eroded 'eyebrows' and transporting non-native invasive seeds to these degraded areas, e.g. Italian thistle, stinkwort, yellow starthistle, etc.	See Master Responses #7 and #14. State Parks understands the concern about bicyclists riding along trail and road edges and the potential for soil disturbance that can contribute to the spread of non-native invasive plant species. It is true that trails can act as vectors for invasive species, particularly where users travel off the established tread and disturb adjacent soils. State Parks conducts invasive plant control efforts every year; however, these efforts are significantly limited by available funding and staffing. As a result, while we work to manage existing infestations, we do not currently have sufficient resources to fully address the additional demands associated with new trails or the formalization of non-system routes included in the RTMP. For future trail-related projects, the RTMP environmental document will propose three years of post-construction Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR) invasive plant monitoring and treatment as part of standard project requirements, funded as part of the project. This approach helps identify and treat new infestations early, when they are most manageable and before they become more widespread. This is an important and practical step toward addressing the introduction and spread of invasive species associated with trail use and construction.
396.	Henry	TOC/List of Figures	Do Not Support	Adding a biking trail to the Woodley/Jason trail entry to Oakmont would be dangerous. Please reconsider this.	See Master Response #15 and #17. In its current state the Woodley/Jason's Trail non-system route may not be suitable for hike/bike use. Much of the route is located on old roadbed and through reconstruction and reengineering, State Parks believes these can be safe and sustainable for hike/bike use.
397.	Lisa L.	ES-6	Change/Recommendation	Based on questions raised at recent stakeholder meetings, the public doesn't understand the implications and timelines for the various levels of environmental documentation/review that will be required for the different categories of plan recommendations. A more robust explanation here and in Chapter 6 is warranted re: the categories of projects that would be included in the IS/MND vs. those that would require an EIR, the timelines for preparation of an IS/MND vs. EIR(s) for those projects. Additionally, there is no mention of the anticipated permitting/consultation timelines for the various categories of projects. A discussion of these potential timelines should be added for full disclosure, to set realistic expectations for project implementation timelines.	See Master Response #8. Chapter 6 of the RTMP will be updated to clarify which activities would be fully addressed in the RTMP IS/MND, would require additional environmental review, and provide additional details on permitting requirements.
398.	Frank	ES-7, Figure ES-1	Change/Recommendation	PLEASE DO NOT INCLUDE BIKES ON THIS NEW TRAIL> Rhyolite and the Woodley trail should be hiking only trails. This is a hazardous proposition. Thanks.	See Master Response #15 and #17. In their current state these non-system routes may not be suitable for hike/bike or hike/bike/horse. Much of these routes are located on old roadbeds and through reconstruction and reengineering, State Parks believes these can be safe and sustainable for hike/bike or hike/bike/horse per RTMP recommendations. The RTMP does not recommend bicycle or horse use on one section of non-system route referred to as Woodley/Jason's Trail due to potential safety and sustainability concerns and the associated resource impacts required to improve conditions. State Parks believes that bike access from the Oakmont community to the multi-use system routes of the Lawndale zone would be a desire by this community. Allowing multi-use on the existing Rhyolite Trail and proposed extension provides opportunity for all trail users to enjoy the natural resources of this area.



Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
399.	J Bayless	5-15, Figure 5-2, Recommendation C-03	Change/Recommendation	[Regarding connector trail between switchbacks along Rough-Go Trail in Recommendation C-03] The Western slope and lower elevations of Annadel are the most impacted by user density. This is largely related to the proximity to public access and trailheads, as well as the density of homes in the area. As such, this trail connector serves an important purpose to provide user separation and alternatives. Rough Go is a very technical trail for all users, and as such can regularly be difficult for uphill and downhill traffic to make way for one another. This adjacent trail should be included in RTMP adoption in order to provide users an alternative path and lessen the load that some of Rough Go Trail carries.	See Master Responses #4, #5, and #11. State Parks believes this comment is in reference to Non-system Route Unnamed 32-5. This route was evaluated and it was determined to be unsustainable as well as impacting natural resources. State Parks recognizes this location of the park is impacted by high trail use and this route currently provides an alternative to the sustainability issues and associated technical elements of Rough-Go Trail. However, the RTMP is addressing this situation through Recommendations C-03, C-09, C-10, C-11, and C-12, which would improve trail conditions on Rough-Go Trail as well as provide alternate multi-use and bike-optimized options to connect Lake Isanjo to Spring Lake Regional Park once implemented. Proper phasing of the RTMP recommendations would be required to ensure options are in place prior to non-system route removals.
400.	chris carlson	5-25	Change/Recommendation	L-04: If Lawndale Trailhead improvements are made, and traffic increases on Lawndale Road, this will cause increased mortality of newts. There is a newt roadkill hotspot on lawndale, from newts crossing to get to/from Ledson marsh. This impact and opportunities to mitigate newt roadkill should be considered in this plan.	See Master Response #7. Thank you for your comments. Newt activity in this area would be considered if and when Recommendation L-04 is implemented to include project specific environmental review.
401.	Lisa L.	6-2	Change/Recommendation	In addition to "CEQA Compliance," need to also include a section on "Permitting and Consultations (e.g. ESA, NHPA Section 106, etc)."	See Master Response #8. Language will be added to Chapter 6 to mention that RTMP implementation will require permitting and consultation as needed, in addition to CEQA compliance.
402.	Lisa L.	6-2	Change/Recommendation	Additionally, there is no mention of the anticipated permitting/consultation timelines for the various categories of projects. A discussion of these potential timelines should be added for full disclosure, to set realistic expectations for project implementation timelines.	See Master Response #8. Language will be added to Chapter 6 to mention that RTMP implementation will require permitting and consultation as needed, in addition to CEQA compliance.
403.	Mr. Beef	Cover	Support	Overall, plan has been exceptionally well developed. Trail users felt listened to and thankful to have opportunities for input. Let's get it in action and keep improving	See Master Response #1.
404.	N/A	Cover	Support	Huge props to State Parks and the consultant! It's clear from the draft that you've listened to the public. You have been pragmatic and progressive in your approach to balancing the recreation needs of current and future visitors, while honoring your duty to protect and preserve this much loved park.	See Master Response #1.
405.	N/A	4-2	Support	Agreed. Kudos to State Parks and Ascent! Great job collecting, analyzing, and interpreting the data, and presenting the management recommendations in a reader-friendly format for a diverse audience.	See Master Response #1.
406.	N/A	3	Do Not Support	Natural resources are being impaired by degradation of soils from erosion of public created social trails and lack of adequate maintenance of Park trails. Biodiversity loss occurring due to such as well as lack of rapid response to invasive non-native plants and control of such invasive plants.	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, #11, and #14.
407.	N/A	3	Do Not Support	Protection of the resource values needs more attention. Many trails badly maintained, heavily eroded, leading to sediment runoff into waterways, etc.	See Master Responses #7 and #14.
408.	Fred	TOC/List of Figures	Change/Recommendation	At the moment there are bikes and other vehicles that far exceed the speed limits - is it possible to make it possible for bikers and hikers to find some common ground in this area?	See Master Responses #6 and #17. CCR 4360 states that the Department may establish speed limits for designated trail use for units or portions thereof. If established, these speed limits will be posted.
409.	Fred	TOC/List of Figures	Change/Recommendation	Hoping for an official Oakmont access point to the Lawndale trail. Thanks.	Recommendation L-05 calls for providing a system trail to the northern park boundary with the Oakmont community.
410.	Fred	TOC/List of Figures	Change/Recommendation	Please force the current residents on Shultz road to remove those large rocks so that at least a few cars can park near that entrance, and is it possible to build a new small parking area so that this entrance can be used? Thank you.	See Master Response #12.
411.	Henry	TOC/List of Figures	Change/Recommendation	Please make provision for parking at the Schulz entrance	See Master Response #12.
412.	Fred	TOC/List of Figures	Change/Recommendation	Hike only trails would be helpful for many reasons.	See Master Response #15.

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
413.	Fred	TOC/List of Figures	Change/Recommendation	Please provide a legitimate/official access to TASP from Oakmont - perhaps from behind the East Rec Center on Oakmont Drive. Another option would be to work on a hiking only official trail from the end of Woodley to the dam. (Jason's trail). There are a lot of 'unofficial trails' in this area, and quite a bit of erosion.	See Master Response #13. Recommendation L-05 calls for providing a system trail to the northern park boundary with the Oakmont community.
414.	Fred	TOC/List of Figures	Change/Recommendation	Please provide parking at the Shultz trail entrance. This should never have been removed by the neighbors. Thank you	See Master Response #12.
415.	Nick	ES-1	Support	As a hiker and biker, I second the Redwood Trails Alliance support for this RTMP. "It reflects a sophisticated vision that balances high-quality recreation with the vital protection of the park's landscapes, wildlife, cultural resources, and history."	See Master Response #1.
416.	mr. Wimmer	ES-1	Change/Recommendation	A museum for the quarries and those who worked in the quarries, indigineous people.	State Parks appreciates the recommendation in this comment, but this type of facility is considered outside the scope of a RTMP and would be better addressed as part of a Cornerstone Document or General Plan process.
417.	Duncan Meyers	ES-2	Change/Recommendation	Multi-Use trails are amazing and are the future. The more different user groups interact the better for the longterm stewardship of this amazing park.	See Master Response #15.
418.	ES	ES-2	Support	Thank you for your diligence on this draft, and for addressing the needs of recreational visitors, and protecting and preserving the park for the future. Very excited to see next steps in bringing this plan to life!	See Master Response #1.
419.	Guest	ES-3	Change/Recommendation	I'd be interested whether there has been any discussion/consideration given to allowing limited access to the park for certain classes of e-bikes (e.g., perhaps only on the fire roads). There is an accessibility component that likely could be (maybe even should be) balanced with safety of all users, impact on trails, etc. While personally, I'd prefer not to have any e-bikes in the park, it seems the complete ban on them (or the education/enforcement strategy) isn't working, so perhaps another option could have more success and be a compromise amongst all users.	See Master Response #2.
420.	Jon	ES-3	Change/Recommendation	The proposed bicycle management pilot projects present an excellent opportunity to evaluate trail use impacts through real-world data. I recommend explicitly including Class 1 e-MTBs within these pilot projects on trails where mountain biking is already permitted. This would allow State Parks to assess actual impacts and user interactions under controlled conditions rather than relying on assumptions, consistent with the Plan's adaptive management approach.	See Master Response #2.
421.	T Boss	ES-3	Change/Recommendation	It makes complete sense to address challenges posed between different types of users through a "pilot" approach, with tools such as monitoring and adaptation to ensure the highest level of success. And while not precedent setting, I would hope positive outcomes might be considered as models for similar challenges at other State Parks.	See Master Response #1.
422.	Kasey O'Killion	ES-3	Support	I am in strong agreement with this statement of strategies for all managed trails within the Park.	See Master Response #1.
423.	T Boss	ES-3	Support	The proposal for a hike-horse only trail between Lake Ilsanjo and Buick Meadow reestablishes an old favorite route for hikers and equestrians and provides solitude and a nature immersive experience. And the focus on bike optimized trails one ridge over should reduce the desire for cyclists to ride in this area. Good planning.	See Master Response #1.
424.	MTBDude	ES-3	Change/Recommendation	[Referring to bicycling trails being hike/bike only] Shouldn't this for bicycles only? And not hike & bike?	See Master Responses #5 and #15.
425.	Guest	ES-3	Support	[Referring to single directional trails for bicycles] This is an interesting solution that could certainly help with the predictability of interactions between cyclists and others (i.e., only anticipating bike traffic from one direction). Secondly, this strategy could also be used to reduce wear/tear of trails from bikes during certain conditions (i.e., if there is a difference in wear/tear depending on grade, single-track, and/or ascend vs. descend). My only concern is that if you already have acknowledged the prevalence of unauthroize e-bike usage within the park, and that you've not been able to curtail this with education/enforcement, what is giving you confidence that single directional trails will see better compliance?	See Master Response #17.



Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
426.	Cynthia K	ES-3	Change/Recommendation	Or, recognizing that the Park is already overly fragmented, do not provide new trails within what are the last remaining large areas of intact habitat.	See Master Response #7.
427.	Kasey O'Killion	ES-3	Support	Yes yes yes to all of this. Better drainage infrastructure will go a long way to complete the "maintain" part of the proposal.	See Master Response #1.
428.	Cynthia K	ES-3	Change/Recommendation	Needs to include education on trail design and maintenance and opportunities for supervised trail maintenance days for local trail user groups, high school cross country teams, bicyclists, etc. When people know WHY and have first hand experience, they are more likely to use the trails respectfully and have buy-in to keeping them well maintained.	See Master Response #14. Recommendation P-02 will be revised to include additional language on education for interested groups on sustainable trail design and maintenance.
429.	Brian	ES-4	Support	Non-system routes are a cultural resource. They are created by the people for the people.	See Master Response #11.
430.	Cynthia K	ES-4	Change/Recommendation	[Referring to the statement that non-system routes have been developed by trail users seeking experience that are not readily available] Such is available at the heavily eroded Winsor	See Master Response #1.
431.	Kasey O'Killion	ES-4	Support	Big props for focusing on community involvement in trail maintainance. More opportunities for users to help become sustainers will only help develop a deeper community commitment to sustainability	See Master Response #1.
432.	Duncan Meyers	ES-4	Support	Please look closely at this topic. SO many of the non-system routes are actually laid out quite well and occupy traditional paths that have been here since the Native people walked these lands. Let's fold them into the system for all to enjoy.	See Master Response #4 and #11.
433.	Eric	ES-4	Change/Recommendation	Work with MTB community and provide the opportunity for input before decommissioning non-system routes. This will lead to greater cooperation and success of any decommissioning work. Removing trails is time consuming and expensive. If unsustainable features can be identified and mitigated it would be a win/win for trail users and State Parks.	See Recommendations P-12 and P-13, which call for coordination with local trail user groups on trail user interest and desired features as well as non-system routes.
434.	T Boss	ES-5	Support	All great goals!	See Master Response #1.
435.	Betty	ES-5	Support	Yes please! Please explore connections through properties to access areas such as Taylor Mountain and Sonoma Mountain Regional Parks with minimal road use.	See Master Response #1.
436.	T Boss	ES-5	Support	Better connectivity to the south and east are good goals.	See Master Response #1.
437.	Betty	ES-5	Do Not Support	Please do not convert Marsh or Two Quarry to unpaved roads.	See Master Responses #16 and #17.
438.	Cynthia K	ES-5	Change/Recommendation	Portable water stations would like encourage people to rely on such, and it seems unlikely that the Park will able to adequately maintain such. Would also substantially increase costs in a situation where maintenance budgets have been inadequate for years. Instead, on Park website, educate people about the necessity to carry their own water and how much the average person needs under various conditions. If people know how much water to bring and carry it themselves, they are less likely to require emergency medical response due to dehydration, etc.	State Parks agrees that education for visitors regarding carrying sufficient water is needed. Water stations as proposed would be coordinated with partners and would likely result in minimal state funding. Water station needs and priority would be determined though the prioritization process discussed in Chapter 6 of the RTMP.
439.	Guest 1	ES-7	Do Not Support	This is all nonsense if you are not "officially" allowing e-bikes.	See Master Response #2.
440.	w	ES-7, Figure ES-1	Support	These bike optimized zones make sense. They will help benefit all user groups by concentrating bike used.	See Master Response #1.
441.	May	ES-7, Figure ES-1	Support	Biking trails here should be included! They are some of my favorite!	See Master Responses #4 and #11.
442.	Bill G.	ES-7, Figure ES-1	Do Not Support	many existing trails here. Not adopting them will not be effective, regardless of the reasoning.	See Master Responses #4 and #11.
443.	Auggie	ES-7, Figure ES-1	Change/Recommendation	Class 1 e-bikes should be permitted in bike optimized areas as well as the main routes to these areas. From my experience, class 1 e-bikes enable older riders to continue to enjoy the very healthy activity of mountain biking.	See Master Response #2.
444.	May	ES-7, Figure ES-1	Support	Love this! Bike optimized zones are great idea!	See Master Response #1.
445.	Betty	ES-7, Figure ES-1	Change/Recommendation	Connection access to Taylor Mountain Regional park is needed	See Master Response #1.

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
446.	Auggie	ES-7, Figure ES-1	Change/Recommendation	Some sort of connection between Marsh and Ridge should be kept. I understand that the current steep hike a bike trail isn't great but there is a good reason that it is heavily used. The connection shouldn't be completely abandoned, a better connection should be created.	RTMP Recommendation B-04 calls for new multi-use trail (hike/bike/horse) between the western portion of Ridge and Marsh Trails to create loop opportunities.
447.	Cynthia K	ES-7, Figure ES-1	Do Not Support	Substantially increased habitat fragmentation compared to existing.	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, and #11.
448.	Betty	ES-7, Figure ES-1	Change/Recommendation	Please explore public access that could connect to Sonoma Mountain Regional Park	See Master Response #1.
449.	T Boss	ES-7, Figure ES-1	Support	As a longtime visitor of the park, I support all the proposals on this map. It's a good balance of enhancements and additions, and should reduce the proliferation of social trails and desire lines when fully realized.	See Master Response #1.
450.	Cynthia K	ES-7, Figure ES-1	Change/Recommendation	Vernal pools are extremely sensitive and easily damaged by bicycle tires and footprints. 90% have already been lost in CA. A trail connection here seems very ill-advised.	See Master Response #7.
451.	MTBDude	ES-7, Figure ES-1	Change/Recommendation	[Referring to Cobblestone Zone bike-optimized zone] This should be bike only	See Master Responses #5 and #15.
452.	Kasey O'Killion	ES-7, Figure ES-1	Support	[Referring to area around the visitor center] Big ups to a bike optimized system in this area. Massive opportunity	See Master Responses #4, #5, #11, and #15.
453.	Auggie	ES-7, Figure ES-1	Change/Recommendation	[Referring to area between Orchard Trail and Channel Drive] Downhill only biking trail to lake here makes sense	See Master Responses #4, #11, and #15.
454.	MTBDude	ES-7, Figure ES-1	Change/Recommendation	[Referring to North Burma Trail] this should be bike only.	See Master Responses #5 and #15.
455.	Bill G.	ES-7, Figure ES-1	Change/Recommendation	[Referring to area between Orchard Trail and Cobblestone Trail] more bike options in this area	See Master Responses #4, #5, #11, and #15.
456.	MTBDude	ES-7, Figure ES-1	Change/Recommendation	[Referring to "Manzanita" area] bike only trails also exist here and should be adopted	See Master Responses #4 and #11.
457.	Cynthia K	ES-7, Figure ES-1	Do Not Support	Major fragmentation, major impacts on wildlife resources.	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, and #11.
458.	MTBDude	ES-7, Figure ES-1	Change/Recommendation	This should be bike only and include the word "hike" if it's going to be part of a bicycle trail corridor	See Master Responses #5 and #15.
459.	May	ES-7, Figure ES-1	Change/Recommendation	A trail connecting lawndale and shultz would solve many issues	See Master Response #7.
460.	Frank	ES-7, Figure ES-1	Change/Recommendation	Please include a small parking area for those who would like to hike on the Schultz trail. Thank you .	See Master Response #12.
461.	T Boss	1-7, Figure 1-2	Support	Great job identifying the unique regions of the park. The Zones are essentially parks within the park, each with different terrain, use patterns, experiences and habitat.	See Master Response #1.
462.	Kasey O'Killion	2-9	Support	Would be interested in further/future ongoing reviews.	The change-in-use evaluation for the Rhyolite Trail is included in Appendix 5 of the RTMP.
463.	Alexander	3-3, Figure 3-1	Change/Recommendation	The conversation should be started to connect TASP with Sugar Loaf Ridge State Park with a planned hike bike trail. A hike bike trail connection should be a priority for the parks department with many benefits including fire resilience.	See Master Response #13.
464.	T Boss	3-5	Change/Recommendation	Are there any equestrian groups we can work with to get more youth into trail riding?	While attracting more youth to equestrian riding is outside the scope of the RTMP, the Redwood Trail Alliance or Sonoma Horse Council may be able to help in this regard.
465.	Betty	3-6	Change/Recommendation	It would be great to bring back an annual mountain bike race to our park. It is greatly missed.	The RTMP does not go to the detail of recommending special events, but RTMP Recommendation P-21 does call for the consideration of hosting additional organized events within the park with associated resource monitoring.
466.	MTBDude	3-8	Change/Recommendation	[Referring to caption on image of Bennett Mountain trails] which could be fixed when adopted into the park	See Master Responses #4, #11, #7, and #15.
467.	May	3-13, Figure 3-4	Change/Recommendation	With little maintainance, this trail could be a great downhill flow bike trail from the picnic table at rough go / live oak to the lake	See Master Responses #4, #11, and #15.



Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
468.	MTBDude	3-17, Figure 3-6	Change/Recommendation	This area on the north side of marsh trail would be great for a downhill bike trail to the lake.	See Master Responses #4, #7, #11, and #15.
469.	MTBDude	3-30	Change/Recommendation	[Referring to parkwide opportunity about decommissioning, rerouting, or reengineering unsustainable non-system routes] aka adoption of non network trails and making them bike only because that's what they were built for	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, and #11.
470.	Ian	3-30	Change/Recommendation	Excessive fee collection hurts low income individuals way more than those with high incomes. That is unacceptable for something as basic as walking on a trail. We shouldn't be creating barriers to the outdoors for the people who don't have as much disposable income. Experiencing the beauty of nature shouldn't require an additional fee.	See Master Response #18. Recommendation P-06 calls for coordinating with Sonoma County Regional Parks on a revised fee structure for Spring Lake Regional Park and TASP, such as a regional pass to provide access to both parks.
471.	Lisa L	3-30	Change/Recommendation	Given the current lack of transparency re: State Parks budget, I would not support enhanced fee collections unless State Parks demonstrates some accountability for current expenditures and priorities at Annadel.	See Master Response #18.
472.	MTBDude	3-30	Do Not Support	[Referring to opportunity for a trail connection north of False Lake Meadow to mitigate resource impacts from non-system routes in the meadow] these exist already	Non-system routes exist here that will require reroutes and reengineering to make them sustainable along a proposed multi-use route.
473.	MTBDude	3-30	Change/Recommendation	"used by mountain bikers" hence they should be adopted and not decommissioned. If decommission of this area does happen, we'll still ride there anyway.	A non-system route may be ridden and enjoyed but that does not mean it is sustainable, maintainable, and not negatively affecting park resources.
474.	MTBDude	3-33	Change/Recommendation	they're suitable for bike only use as people ride on them all the time	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7, #11, and #15.
475.	Betty	3-33	Support	It would be good to have a few bike only trails that are one directional. This area would be a good place to consider this	See Master Responses #17.
476.	Brian	3-33	Change/Recommendation	Any trail that a horse can navigate is good for bicycles too. Limiting access on multi-use capable trails to only a user group that represents 0.3% seems unjustified.	See Master Response #15.
477.	Betty	3-33	Change/Recommendation	[Referring to Steve's "S" Trail] Please create a bike access trail that parallels this. It is obvious by user demand that it is necessary.	See Master Responses #4, #7, and #15. Chapter 3, "Planning Opportunities and Constraints," presents possibilities considered in planning decisions and may not represent proposed RTMP recommendations. Please refer to Chapter 5, "Plan Recommendations," to view draft recommendations.
478.	Betty	3-33	Support	[Referring to opportunity for trail connection through Geary Ranch to Bennett Mountain summit] Yes please	See Master Response #13. Although this opportunity was considered during the planning process it was not ultimately recommended in the Public Draft RTMP due to lack of ownership and access agreements in place.
479.	Betty	3-33	Support	Please do not turn into a unpaved road	See Master Responses #16 and #17.
480.	Alexander	3-34	Support	From the Lawndale Zone there should be a plan in place to buy up land and add a trail from TASP to Sugar Loaf Ridge State Park. Add a hike bike trail connection between these to amazing parks!	See Master Response #13.
481.	Betty	3-34	Do Not Support	[Referring to opportunity for Lawndale to Schultz trail connection] Yes please, this would be a fantastic connector	See Master Response #7.
482.	Betty	3-34	Support	[Referring to opportunity for trail connection from Rhyolite Trail to Frey Canyon Overlook] Yes please	See Master Response #7. Although this opportunity was considered during the planning process it was not ultimately recommended in the draft plan due to topographic constraints and resources concerns in Frey Canyon.
483.	Betty	3-34	Support	[Referring to opportunity for Lawndale to Schultz trail connection] Definitely support more loops/connections here	See Master Response #7.
484.	Betty	3-34	Support	Yes to making this accessible including bikes	See Master Responses #4, #7, and #15. Chapter 3, "Planning Opportunities and Constraints," presents possibilities considered in planning decisions and may not represent proposed RTMP recommendations. Please refer to Chapter 5, "Plan Recommendations," to view draft recommendations.
485.	Betty	3-34	Support	No need to sanitize this trail. please just maintain to manage erosion	See Master Response #14.

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
486.	Betty	3-35, Figure 3-10	Support	Both need to include bike access please	See Master Responses #4, #7, and #15. Chapter 3, "Planning Opportunities and Constraints," presents possibilities considered in planning decisions and may not represent proposed RTMP recommendations. Please refer to Chapter 5, "Plan Recommendations," to view draft recommendations.
487.	Betty	3-35, Figure 3-10	Change/Recommendation	Yes please	See Master Response #1
488.	Betty	3-35, Figure 3-10	Support	Yes please	See Master Response #1
489.	Betty	3-35, Figure 3-10	Support	Yes please, bike access included	See Master Responses #4, #7, and #15. Chapter 3, "Planning Opportunities and Constraints," presents possibilities considered in planning decisions and may not represent proposed RTMP recommendations. Please refer to Chapter 5, "Plan Recommendations," to view draft recommendations.
490.	Betty	3-35, Figure 3-10	Support	Yes to bike access trail connection	See Master Responses #4, #7, and #15. Chapter 3, "Planning Opportunities and Constraints," presents possibilities considered in planning decisions and may not represent proposed RTMP recommendations. Please refer to Chapter 5, "Plan Recommendations," to view draft recommendations.
491.	Betty	3-35, Figure 3-10	Support	Please consider a bike only connector as well	See Master Responses #4, #7, and #15. Chapter 3, "Planning Opportunities and Constraints," presents possibilities considered in planning decisions and may not represent proposed RTMP recommendations. Please refer to Chapter 5, "Plan Recommendations," to view draft recommendations.
492.	Christian	3-35, Figure 3-10	Support	These trails in their current condition are exceptional trails for hiking and biking. Great additions and worth while to keep in the park.	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7 #11, and #14.
493.	MTBDude	3-35, Figure 3-10	Support	it doesn't need to be reengineered or "made easier" just built some d*** water bars	See Master Response #14.
494.	MTBDude	3-35, Figure 3-10	Support	by adopting the trails that already exist in here	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7 #11, and #14.
495.	Betty	3-35, Figure 3-10	Do Not Support	Please do not turn Two Quarry back into a road. Just manage it for erosion and keep it a trail with character and some difficulty	See Master Responses #16 and #17.
496.	Betty	3-37, Figure 3-11	Support	This is a strong example of what happens when our public funds are not used to maintain our existing trails and were used instead to "stick" and barricade the social trails that were being better maintained by the public. This is a shame that South Burma degraded to this point.	See Master Response #14.
497.	Christian	3-37, Figure 3-11	Do Not Support	Fix the erosion and water draining issue.	See Master Response #14. It was difficult to pinpoint the exact location being referenced. Please send exact location to trails@parks.ca.gov.
498.	MTBDude	3-37, Figure 3-11	Change/Recommendation	fix the erosion issue on south burma trail	See Master Response #14. This is included in RTMP Recommendations R-02.
499.	Mr. Beef	3-37, Figure 3-11	Change/Recommendation	Great opportunity for drinking water	See Master Response #1.
500.	Betty	3-37, Figure 3-11	Change/Recommendation	Yes to all these trail opportunities	See Master Response #1.
501.	Betty	3-37, Figure 3-11	Change/Recommendation	Making this a reasonable and sustainable connection would be fantastic	See Master Response #1.
502.	Betty	3-39, Figure 3-12	Support	Please do not sanitize or turn into a unpaved road.	See Master Responses #16 and #17.
503.	MTBDude	3-39, Figure 3-12	Support	a fee collection kiosk is a terrible idea,	See Master Response #18.
504.	Mr. Beef	3-39, Figure 3-12	Do Not Support	The state park should not be for the wealthy. Increase parking fees, provide access with sonoma county regional pass for locals, let volunteers maintain trails. All of these are better options than a general fee kiosk. Willing to accept a kiosk for trail donations with 100% going to annadel trail maintenance.	See Master Response #18.
505.	Betty	3-41, Figure 3-13	Do Not Support	This connector would be fantastic (yes to bike access)	See Master Response #1.
506.	Betty	3-41, Figure 3-13	Change/Recommendation	HECK yes!! this would be amazing	See Master Response #1.



Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
507.	Betty	3-41, Figure 3-13	Support	Yes, it would be great to have this trail added back into the system (bike access)	See Master Responses #4, #7, and #15. Chapter 3, "Planning Opportunities and Constraints," presents possibilities considered in planning decisions and may not represent proposed RTMP recommendations. Please refer to Chapter 5, "Plan Recommendations," to view draft recommendations.
508.	Betty	3-41, Figure 3-13	Support	YES!	See Master Response #1.
509.	Betty	3-43, Figure 3-14	Support	Yes please, it would be fantastic to be able to access Bennet Valley Road from here by bike	See Master Response #1.
510.	MTBDude	3-43, Figure 3-14	Support	how about no fee collection kiosk	See Master Response #18.
511.	Doug	3-43, Figure 3-14	Support	In my experience, maybe half of the bicycles in the park are now e-bikes. They are significantly heavier than typical bikes and create more wear on the trails. They are often ridden much faster than typical bikes – particularly uphill – creating more opportunity for conflict with other riders and trail users. In addition, they lead to a significant increase in use of the park, including areas that previously saw lower use. The plan should address this fact head-on.	See Master Response #2.
512.	Jon	3-43, Figure 3-14	Change/Recommendation	As trail classifications and designations are refined, I recommend evaluating Class 1 e-MTBs as functionally equivalent to mountain bikes for classification purposes, except where site-specific environmental or safety concerns warrant different treatment. This approach would provide consistency and transparency in how trail uses are designated.	See Master Response #2.
513.	Lisa L.	4-2	Change/Recommendation	The statement that "Currently, none of the trails within TASP allow e-bike use" is misleading. Trails don't allow or prohibit e-bike use, State Parks policy does. This sentence should be rewritten to state that, "Currently, e-bike use is expressly prohibited on all trails within TASP." That being said, it's no secret that e-bike use represents a high percentage of all mountain bike use in TASP. Consequently, I'm baffled by the absence of any further discussion of e-bike use in the RTMP. As due diligence, the RTMP should disclose TASP's anticipated approach to addressing ongoing e-bike use in the TASP in light of the statewide policy.	See Master Response #2. This will be rewritten to state that "Currently State Parks does not allow e-bike use at TASP per state park e-bike policy."
514.	Betty	4-2	Change/Recommendation	We absolutely need some bike only trails	See Master Responses #5 and #15.
515.	Jon	4-2	Change/Recommendation	Parkwide recommendations emphasize equitable access, sustainability, and adaptive management. Including conditional Class 1 e-MTB access within these recommendations—subject to monitoring and adjustment—would align with these principles and support inclusive recreation without compromising resource protection.	See Master Response #2.
516.	Lisa L.	4-2	Change/Recommendation	Given the current lack of transparency re: State Parks budget, I would not support a revised fee structure unless State Parks demonstrates some accountability for current expenditures and priorities at Annadel. We would also need transparency in the accounting of how the Regional Pass funds would be allocated.	See Master Response #18.
517.	w	5-2	Change/Recommendation	Simply removing all the steep & technical trails in the name of public safety will only upset the MTB community and lead to more conflict and non-system trail creation. Expert trails MUST exist for the community. Put whatever warning signs you need to feel like the public is aware, but the trails need to be there. There's an inherent risk to outdoor recreation, we don't need to be helicopter parents for the entire world.	See Master Responses #4, #5 and #15.
518.	T Boss	5-3	Do Not Support	Engage with local groups, create b-lines around technical features, enhance for sustainability, make some trails directional... this seems like a formula for success. This is also an opportunity to educate visitors about current best management practices around trail design, construction, maintenance and management, and the impacts social trails can have without thoughtful planning.	See Master Response #1.
519.	Doug	5-4	Change/Recommendation	This is so critical – the importance cannot be emphasized enough. Wayfinding is critical to help support use of the correct/appropriate/legitimate trail network. People can't be faulted for going "off trail" if the wayfinding is absent. Furthermore, signage should help people understand why it is important to stick to official trails. It would be immensely helpful to educate users (especially cyclists and equestrians) about why we should avoid trails when they are wet. People don't realize they're hurting the very trails they enjoy when they ride soon after it rains.	See Master Response #6.

APPENDIX A: COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TO COMMENTS ON THE PUBLIC REVIEW DRAFT RTMP

Comment Number	Commenter	Comment Location	Comment Sentiment	Comment ²	Response ³
520.	Betty	5-5	Change/Recommendation	Thank you for all your work and to listening to the community, it shows.	See Master Response #1.
521.	w	5-6, Recommendation P-24	Support	The non-system trails are serving a purpose. You can't simply remove them all. WE NEED MORE DIFFICULT TRAILS THAN BLUES AND GREENS	See Master Responses #4, #5, #7 #11, and #14.
522.	Gondak Cellars	5-7, Figure 5-1	Support	I proposed to my wife on this trail!.. She said yes! Can't wait to learn what this one is named!	See Master Response #1.
523.	w	5-9	Change/Recommendation	Some of these trails should be steeper and more technical. Don't just turn everything into a green flowtrail.	See Master Response #5.
524.	Brian	5-12	Support	All of this erosion was caused by lack of trail maintenance. It got progressively worse each year because there was no effort made to direct water off of the trail.	See Master Response #14.
525.	w	5-15, Figure 5-2	Change/Recommendation	If you pull out all the trails from this area, they will be put back in almost immediately. Don't do it. Work within the framework of what's there.	See Master Responses #4, #7 #11, and #14.
526.	Kenny Brown	5-17	Support	I miss "Upper Steves" it ran from near the bathrooms up the canyon and connected onto Canyon Trail east of Ridge Trail	Although the RTMP does not call for the reestablishment of this trail, it does recommend new system trails in the general area as the previous Middle and Upper Steve's "S" Trails such R-08 and B-02.
527.	J Bayless	5-19, Figure 5-3	Change/Recommendation	[Regarding trail connection between Lawndale Trail at southern edge of the zone to the hairpin turn on Lawndale Trail to the north] This segment is an important alternative to Lawndale double-track road. Contrary to Jason Spann's cursory evaluation, this alternative to the Woodley trail entrance is important *because* the Lawndale experience is suboptimal as existing.	See Master Responses #11, #4, #5, #7, #15. The informal, non-system routes in this area were evaluated as part of the planning process and were determined to be either unsustainable or unmaintainable in their current configurations. While it is acknowledged that such routes could potentially be improved through reengineering or rerouting, the overarching goals of the RTMP in this zone prioritize reducing habitat fragmentation and minimizing impacts to sensitive resources. As a result, incorporation of the routes in this area was not advanced. The intent of the proposed system trails in this zone is to provide necessary connectivity while allowing visitors to experience the area's natural resources in a manner that is sustainable and promotes resource conservation. These proposed routes are designed to balance recreational access with environmental protection. Additionally, it is not clear what specific aspects of the Lawndale Trail experience are considered suboptimal. It is important to note that trails in this area are not intended to provide bike-optimized experiences. Such experiences are more appropriately accommodated in other areas of the park identified as suitable for that purpose.
528.	Lisa L.	5-23, Figure 5-4	Change/Recommendation	How is the State Park's budget being factored into the RTMP? At present, budget shortfalls prevent both adequate trail maintenance and enforcement of existing trail use policies. A more robust discussion of how the recommendations will be prioritized in light of existing and projected budget constraints is warranted. Successful implementation of the RTMP is dependent on a responsible accounting of State Parks' budget.	See Master Response #8.

Note: N/A = not available.

¹ Sources include email, online feedback, or written comments provided at Public Meeting #2.

² All comments are copied verbatim from comments submitted during the public outreach efforts.

³ Some of the responses include references to master responses. Those master responses are included in the main body of this document.