



## CARMEL AREA STATE PARKS GENERAL PLAN AND EIR

### Preferred Alternative Agency/Stakeholder Meeting Summary of Key Points

**Date:** June 1, 2016  
**Time:** 10:00am – 12:00 pm  
**Location:** C DPR Monterey District Headquarters, Training Room, Monterey

#### Meeting Purpose

- Present Preferred Alternative
- Discuss comments on the Preferred Alternative

#### Planning Team Attendees:

Ellie Wagner, California State Parks	Mike Parker, Ascent Environmental
Mat Fuzie, California State Parks	Curtis Alling, Ascent Environmental
Steve Bachman, California State Parks	Heidi Gen Kuong, Ascent Environmental
Jim Bilz, California State Parks	Donna Plunkett, practiceNATURE

### Summary of Key Points

#	Key Points Summarized from the Meeting
1	<b>Introductions and Presentation</b>
2	<p>The presentation included the public response to the draft alternative concepts and California State Parks (CSP) realigned approach to focus more on conservation in the Preferred Alternative. Following the overview of the Preferred Alternative, the schedule and next steps for the General Plan and EIR (GP/EIR) process were presented.</p> <p>Key aspects of the Preferred Alternative, as outlined in the presentation, include:</p> <p><b>PLSNR</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ The Preferred Alternative would reduce visitor pressure and degradation of resources, while managing visitation and parking. A reservation system could be considered.</li> <li>▲ The Preferred Alternative would remove parking from the Reserve (except for ADA and staff access), revegetate some of the current unpaved parking areas, and provide an alternative conveyance system for visitors.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ The three primary management zones identify allowable uses and accommodate ecosystem protection and restoration goals.</li> <li>▲ Hudson House would remain as employee housing, but with an option to explore visitor uses in the future (if the property and resources can support the use).</li> </ul> <p><b>New State Park - Coastal Area</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ The Preferred Alternative would retain existing natural and cultural preserves and create new management zones. Portions of the Lagoon/Wetland management zone and Caltrans Mitigation Bank zone may be included with the existing Carmel River Lagoon and Wetland Natural Preserve in the future after completion of already planned infrastructure improvements.</li> <li>▲ Large visitor facilities are not proposed in this area. Limited facilities for interpretation and visitor information could be provided at Odello Farm.</li> <li>▲ Some new parking would be developed under the Preferred Alternative at Odello Farm management zone. Parking adjacent to Bay School could also be developed in the Coastal Margin management zone, if parking is removed on SR 1.</li> </ul> <p><b>New State Park - Inland Area</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Large new, natural preserves are proposed that cover most of the inland area, which would promote substantial preservation and provide the highest level of resource protection.</li> <li>▲ The San Jose Creek Natural Preserve would follow the creek, protecting riparian and stream habitat.</li> <li>▲ The Backcountry Zone allows for primitive camping, because it is adjacent to Palo Corona Regional Park, which is anticipated to allow remote, primitive camping.</li> <li>▲ The main area for visitor interface is the A.M. Allan Ranch Zone. Existing employee housing would remain.</li> <li>▲ New parking could be built to serve visitors to the inland area. Also, parking may be developed for visitors to the Reserve, if parking is removed from SR 1, with safe visitor conveyance. Options include a tunnel crossing beneath the highway or a tram/shuttle system.</li> </ul> <p><b>Hatton Canyon Property</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ The goal of this property is to maintain it as is until a transfer to another local or regional agency can be arranged.</li> <li>▲ No new activities or facilities are proposed.</li> </ul>
3	<b>Input from Stakeholders</b>
4	Input was invited from attendees, including comments and questions. Each participant was given a few minutes to share comments on the preferred alternative. Questions were offered for participants to consider regarding topics of interest to California State Parks.

Questions Posed to Participants:

- ▲ *How do the responsibilities of your agency/organization interface with the Preferred Alternative?*
- ▲ *What aspects of the Preferred Alternative do you support?*
- ▲ *Are there any lingering concerns regarding the Preferred Alternative or the overall GP/EIR?*

Below are summaries of the main points raised in discussions with agency and stakeholder participants:

**Charging Fees (Walk-ins, Trail Fee, etc.)**

- ▲ Regarding concern over being able to control access to the Reserve, the planning team is currently investigating the legality of charging entrance fees for walk-ins
- ▲ A northern CA State Park charges a trail fee, which has been successful. The GP could explore this option.

**Parking Lots and Highway Entrances**

- ▲ Regarding potential parking areas, a participant encouraged that the EIR include highway improvements and evaluate feasible options to accommodate these improvements. The GP will include concept drawings for highway entrances, including highway improvements needed.

**State Route 1 Parking and Caltrans Coordination**

- ▲ Caltrans is interested in continuing to work with CSP throughout the GP process. Caltrans wants to be a part of developing and defining the traffic/transportation section of the document.
- ▲ Caltrans reported that parking on SR 1 can only be removed under the following circumstances:
  - A documented safety issue with accompanying traffic analysis
  - A public health or safety hazard
  - Access needs for fire suppression
  - Prohibition by ordinance adopted by local government
- ▲ There should be a comprehensive look at how to solve parking and traffic issues. A working group consisting of Monterey Peninsula Regional Park District, the County, Caltrans, and CSP could examine transportation issues and collectively identify solutions for the region. Without collaborative efforts on key issues, a solution could be difficult. The GP could support a comprehensive transportation vision, offering various scenarios and allowing for options.

**Adaptation and Sea Level Rise**

- ▲ The GP should contain policy direction for CSP to work proactively with Caltrans and the Coastal Commission's Transportation Liaison Unit to adapt/re-align/elevate SR 1 at the Carmel River floodplain and San Jose Creek to accommodate flood elevations from sea level rise. Caltrans does not currently have projects proposed in this area that address SLR.
- ▲ Parking at Whaler's Cove and other areas that are affected by sea level rise have been considered

and will be addressed in the GP.

### **Hatton Canyon**

- ▲ The GP should show Hatton Canyon Property (HCP) as part of the Coastal Zone.
- ▲ The GP should indicate that there could be a potential bikeway extension to connect to City of Carmel's existing bikeway along the east side of SR 1.
- ▲ Existing sewer lines, managed by Carmel Area Wastewater District (CAWD), run through HCP. Because infrastructure is already in place, retaining a trail would be compatible with maintenance access needs. CAWD would be interested in owning the property.
- ▲ Caltrans continues to recommend that the document support the long-term goals to develop lower Hatton Canyon as a multi-use, transportation staging location for the Carmel/Big Sur area and CSP facilities. Caltrans suggests the GP include clear language that supports this concept as a strategy to address transportation and resource protection needs.

### **Coastal Permit**

- ▲ All four units are within the Coastal Zone, which requires that a coastal development permit be issued for any new facilities. This acts as an extra safeguard for protection of coastal resources and requires review of proposed development.
- ▲ In compliance with the Coastal Act, local jurisdictions with coastal zones are required to prepare Local Coastal Programs (LCPs) that must be certified by the Coastal Commission. The GP should be consistent with the county LCP.

### **San Jose Creek Canyon Road (New State Park – Inland Area)**

- ▲ The road is not paved, contrary to what is indicated on the map. Please correct the map.

### **Easements in New State Park – Coastal Area Preserves**

- ▲ CAWD has sewer infrastructure located in the existing mitigation bank and preserve areas in the New State Park – Coastal Area. Recognizing that maintenance and access is needed to maintain infrastructure, easements are necessary. Access routes were left intact in the Preferred Alternative, and the GP can provide additional detail regarding easements and maintenance access.

### **Naming**

- ▲ Naming of the units is not decided as part of the GP approval, but it can occur in a parallel process. The State Park and Recreation Commission makes the final determination regarding park names. Naming recommendations are provided to the Commission before a decision is reached.

### **New State Park – Inland Area**

- ▲ The proposed Point Lobos Ridge Natural Preserve will be managed consistent with Proposition 117

	<p>(California Wildlife Protection Act) requirements. The preserve and funding stipulations allow for public trail use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ Parts of the New State Park – Inland Area are not contiguous. Providing access between the properties would require an agreement with MPRPD. It is important to recognize the connectivity between parks, to create a more seamless visitor experience.</li> </ul> <p><b>Preliminary GP/Draft EIR Process</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ It is important to clearly specify in the GP the potential actions that need to occur to implement portions of the plan, so the readers can understand implementation approaches and timing.</li> </ul>
5	<b>Meeting Wrap-up and Conclusion</b>
6	Participants have until June 15, 2016 to submit their comments on the preferred alternative. Comments received during the comment period can be found in their entirety in Attachment B.

**Attachment A: Preferred Alternative Agency/Stakeholder Meeting Sign-in Sheets**

**Attachment B: Compilation of all Agency/Stakeholder Comments Received**