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CALL TO ORDER

Legal notice having been given, this meeting of the California State Park and Recreation Commission was called to order at 9:08 a.m. by Commission Chair Bobby Shriver. Chair Shriver introduced the commissioners present and explained the process by which members of the public could address the Commission.

AGENDA ITEM 1:
APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE AUGUST 24, 2007, MEETING IN MORRO BAY

Chair Shriver asked for a motion to approve the draft minutes of the August 24th, 2007 meeting in Morro Bay. Motion Commissioner Baylis, second Commissioner Scherman. The commissioners voted unanimously to approve the minutes as submitted.

AGENDA ITEM 2:
CHAIR'S REPORT/RECOGNITIONS

Chair Shriver asked Commissioner Jack Baylis to read the names of staff members who had recently retired from California State Parks. Commissioner Baylis expressed the Commission’s thanks to these individuals for their many years of service and read the following names:
Chair Shriver noted that these many years of service illustrated the amazing loyalty of California State Parks staff.

AGENDA ITEM 3:
APPROVAL OF SPECIAL REDWOOD GROVES

Chair Shriver asked Commissioner Acquanetta Warren to read the requests to establish special redwood groves. Commissioner Warren read a resolution establishing the following groves as requested by Save the Redwoods League:
The Philip Lamson Memorial Grove
in Jedediah Smith Redwoods State Park
Robert and Phyllis Henigson, donors

The Henigson Family Grove
in Jedediah Smith Redwoods State Park
Robert and Phyllis Henigson, donors

The commissioners voted unanimously to adopt the resolutions establishing these special redwood groves. Chair Shriver expressed the Commission’s thanks to the donors for their generous donations.

AGENDA ITEM 4:
DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Chair Shriver introduced California State Parks Director Ruth Coleman to present her Director’s Report.

Director Coleman called the commissioners’ attention to the printed copy of her report each had received, noting that she would provide a brief update on several events that had taken place since the last Commission meeting.

Colonel Allensworth State Historic Park – Director Coleman reported on the establishment of a successful agreement between a neighboring land owner and California State Parks that resulted in the purchase of development rights, thereby avoiding a proposal to construct a dairy and graze 12,500 cows near Colonel Allensworth State Historic Park in Tulare County. Director Coleman noted that the agreement was successful in three ways, in that it protected the park from development, compensated the land owner, and honored the integrity of the local land use authority in Tulare County.

Budget Update – Director Coleman noted that the current proposed budget included a $13.5 million reduction for California State Parks. The Director explained that the budget reductions of the past had been disproportionately applied to State Parks and provided these details: In the mid-1990s State Parks lost over 500 staff positions in a large cut, and in early 2000 State Parks lost approximately 100 additional staff positions. These and other reductions of the past, in spite of considerable efforts directed toward reorganization and maximizing efficiency, resulted in a exceptionally spare California State Parks. The need to reduce State Parks budget by an additional $13.5 million, while preserving the park experience for as many visitors as possible, resulted in a recommendation by California State Parks to close 48 parks – which would affect approximately 10 percent of State Parks’ user base while retaining the current visitor experience for 90 percent of users. Director Coleman noted that while this was a painful decision and not one that was taken lightly by park professionals, this was State Parks’ proposal for addressing the required reductions in budget. The Director explained that since the proposed budget had been released there had been considerable debate in the state legislature, with many questions being posed to California State Parks. Director Coleman related one of the more frequently asked questions, regarding whether volunteers could operate parks instead of staff. The Director explained that while California State Parks currently utilized at least 17,000 volunteers (one of the largest volunteer programs of any state agency) who provide thousands of hours of exceptional service, it is difficult to find volunteers willing to perform, for example, maintenance work which must be taken care of on a full-time basis. Director Coleman also noted that the proposed budget reduction could not be compensated for by increasing park user fees. She added that fees had already been increased considerably since 2000, without any increase in the level of service provided. Related to fees, the Director noted that while the state’s Legislative Analyst had proposed that an increase of one dollar per park visitor could compensate for the proposed reduction, this proposal failed to recognize that State Parks does not calculate or collect user fees by the person, but rather by vehicle, with many cases where there are no charges at all, as state law prohibits the collection of fees from visiting school groups that make up a large number of the visitors to some park units. Director Coleman further explained that to compensate for a reduction of $13.5 million, fees would need to increase
by approximately 40 percent, and that an increase of this magnitude would make parks unaffordable to some users, thereby resulting in a reduction in attendance and limiting the amount of the reduction that would actually be compensated for by the fee increase. The Director added that as camping reservations for the summer of 2008 were already sold out, any increase in fees would not have an effect until after the current year’s peak season. Director Coleman also noted that as user fees are entirely voluntary, the more State Parks’ budget is dependent on fees the greater the amount at risk from reductions in visitation, whether it be the result of bad weather, high gasoline prices, response to increased fees, etc. She added that she believed a discussion of user fees would be a good debate to have in the state legislature. The Director noted that 85 percent of State Parks’ costs are fixed costs related to personnel, with about 51 percent of the current State Parks’ budget being fee-based. She added that the sensitive relationship between fees and visitation had been well-documented during the fee adjustments of the early 2000s. Director Coleman concluded her report by stating that the decision to propose park closures had been a difficult one, and that this proposal would likely be debated extensively in the state legislature.

Chair Shriver thanked Director Coleman for her report and asked for questions from the commissioners.

Commissioner Caryl Hart noted that during the Commission’s February 1st, 2008 phone meeting a committee of the Commission was established to consider the current budget situation. Commissioner Hart noted that the circumstances were exceptionally serious for California State Parks in that a proposal to close park units had never before been made except during wartime. Commissioner Hart proposed that the Commission conduct two public hearings, one in northern California and one in the south, to take public input on the subject. The Commissioner stated that the goal of the hearings would be to generate creative solutions to both the current budget situation and the long-term funding of California State Parks.

Chair Shriver asked for the commissioners’ opinions on Commissioner Hart’s proposal.

A discussion followed wherein Commissioner Hart, Commissioner Gail Kautz, Commissioner Sophia Scherman, and Commissioner Acquanetta Warren expressed concerns about the proposed budget and how it could affect California State Parks. Commissioner Gail Kautz agreed to join Commissioner Hart on a committee of the Commission that would monitor the budget situation and explore creative alternatives to closing parks and funding California State Parks for the future. Commissioner Kautz encouraged members of the public who were present to become involved. Commissioner Sophia Scherman noted that as an elected official (Commissioner Scherman serves on the City Council of Elk Grove, California) she was greatly in favor of public input and supported the proposal to conduct hearings in northern and southern California to obtain input. She volunteered to assist in any way that she could.

Chair Shriver asked Director Coleman when she thought would be the best time to conduct the hearings and perform outreach to the state legislature.

Director Coleman replied that budget subcommittee hearings would take place during March and early April 2008, with the governor’s May Revise of the budget available in mid-May. Director Coleman noted that she believed a public call for creative solutions to the budget situation could be beneficial. The Director also noted the governor’s office was highly supportive of public-private partnerships, among other ideas, that could be employed to keep parks open. She emphasized that the proposal to close park units did not originate in the governor’s office, but with park professionals and California State Parks.

Commissioner Acquanetta Warren stated that it would be a good idea for commissioners to attend the budget subcommittee meetings to speak in support of California State Parks.

A discussion took place regarding when these meetings could be conducted. Commissioner Hart suggested that the meetings should take place prior to the release of the May Revise of the budget, and that they should be conducted as soon as possible, probably no later than late April, 2008. Director Coleman noted that the legislative subcommittees rarely, if ever, make final decisions prior to the release of the May Revise of the budget. It was agreed that the meetings should be conducted in late April, 2008. Chair Shriver directed Commission staff to begin planning for these meetings. The Chair noted that this action
was a direction to staff and not a resolution of the Commission.

There being no further comments on the Director’s Report, Chair Shriver stated that he wished to make some observations on the recent California Coastal Commission meeting concerning the proposed toll road and San Onofre State Beach. The Chair noted that he had attended the Coastal Commission meeting, and that he was inspired by the presence of 2,500 and 3,500 people (reports vary), the largest number in the history of the Coastal Commission. Chair Shriver stated that most of the attendees had traveled from the areas of Orange County that would be impacted by the toll road, and that he found it interesting that so many who, it was said, would be saved from sitting in traffic by the toll road, would be willing to sit in traffic to express their opposition to the toll road. He stated that it was a very inspiring thing to observe. Chair Shriver also mentioned the meeting that had been conducted by the State Park and Recreation Commission a little over two years previously (November 3rd, 2005) where opposition to the toll road project brought out the largest attendance ever at a meeting of the State Park and Recreation Commission. The Chair commended the citizens of Orange County, and all the citizens who attended these meetings to express their support for San Onofre State Beach. He noted that the discussion of the proposed toll road was not over and that the toll road authority was appealing the Coastal Commission decision to the Federal Department of Commerce, which could overturn the decision. Chair Shriver again noted how inspired he had been in attending the Coastal Commission meeting and thanked those who participated.

The Chair recognized Commissioner Acquanetta Warren, who stated that she wished to comment on the meeting pertaining to Colonel Allensworth State Historic Park that Director Coleman had referenced. Commissioner Warren noted that the neighboring property owner was pleased with the resolution of the situation. The Commissioner stated that she wished to personally thank Director Coleman, State Parks General Counsel Bradly Torgan, and everyone who had been involved with resolving the situation. Commissioner Warren said that she had met with church groups who were very happy that California State Parks had been able to effectively negotiate with the developer to find a solution that was acceptable to everyone involved.

Director Coleman thanked Commissioner Warren for her compliment. Chair Shriver noted that the negotiations to prevent the construction of a large commercial dairy in close proximity to Colonel Allensworth State Historic Park had been a tremendous accomplishment.

Chair Shriver announced that he would now hear public comment on the budget discussion and called Elizabeth Goldstein, President of the California State Parks Foundation, and Traci Verardo-Torres, Director of Legislation and Policy for the California State Parks Foundation.

Ms. Goldstein and Ms. Verardo-Torres provided the commissioners with an overview of the California State Parks Foundation’s “Save Our State Parks” campaign (www.SaveStateParks.org). They described how the Foundation had partnered with over 100 organizations throughout the state to launch the campaign in response to the proposed budget and the plan to close 48 State Park System units. Ms. Goldstein and Ms. Verardo-Torres spoke of working with state legislators and State Parks’ many stakeholders to take advantage of the current budget situation. They pointed out that the current budget situation was not new, and that it was not a problem of the current administration, as California State Parks had faced a similar crisis in 1991-1992 and had faced difficult fiscal challenges over the past several decades. They discussed the impact of park closures on tourism and local economies and emphasized that the long-term goal of the Save Our State Parks campaign was to provide long-term fiscal solutions to ensure the health of the California State Park System in perpetuity.

Chair Shriver asked if the campaign included a process by which private donors could make contributions. Ms. Goldstein replied that information on this subject was available on the campaign’s web site.

Commissioner Acquanetta Warren suggested that the Save Our State Parks campaign should work to establish a relationship with organizations that are making an effort to fight childhood obesity, especially given Governor Schwarzenegger’s support of efforts to combat this growing concern. Commissioner
Warren recommended that the Save Our State Parks web site offer links to organizations like Healthy Start and First 5. Ms. Goldstein replied that this was a terrific suggestion that she would pursue.

Chair Shriver recognized Ms. Betty Winholtz, who spoke concerning the proposed park closures and the large number of park units proposed for closure in San Luis Obispo County. Ms. Winholtz also reviewed the content of a letter sent by the City of Morro Bay to Governor Schwarzenegger in which the city made five proposals to aid in the funding of California State Parks. Ms. Winholtz provided the commissioners with a copy of the city’s letter.

Chair Shriver asked Director Ruth Coleman if Ms. Winholtz was correct in stating that 62 percent of the state park units in San Luis Obispo County were proposed for closure.

Director Coleman explained that a 10 percent budget reduction had been proposed for each park district. The Director noted that since Hearst Castle accounted for a very large portion of the budget for park units in San Luis Obispo County it became necessary to recommend closure of a large number of other park units in order to keep Hearst Castle open. Director Coleman also explained that parks were proposed for closure on a revenue basis rather than on the merits of a particular park. The situation at Hearst Castle was such that the ratio of cost to revenue is so close that no real savings would be attained by closing the unit. Conversely, California State Parks can realize a significant savings by closing the undeveloped parks in the area that share staff; closing all of the units served by a particular staff would result in savings.

Chair Shriver stated that this was a good explanation. The Chair also noted that there were many beautiful parks in San Luis Obispo County, including some properties that were not yet open to the public.

Director Coleman stated that those properties not yet open to the public would remain closed. She concluded that State Parks recognized that the large number of proposed park closures was not desirable for residents of San Luis Obispo County.

AGENDA ITEM 5:
PUBLIC HEARING

Chair Shriver opened the public hearing portion of the meeting at 9:45 a.m. The Chair explained that in addition to the materials the commissioners received prior to today’s meeting they would now hear a short presentation on State Parks’ proposal for the preliminary general plan and environmental impact for Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park by Dan Ray, Chief of California State Parks’ Planning Division.

ITEM 5A:
Consideration and action on the Department’s recommendation to approve the preliminary general plan & environmental impact report for Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park

Dan Ray, Chief of California State Parks’ Planning Division, presented an overview of the proposed general plan and environmental impact report for Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park. Mr. Ray described the history of the park and the process utilized to develop the proposed general plan. He provided an outline of the parks’ resources, the six proposed management zones, and the minimal development proposals. Mr. Ray noted that Barney Matsumoto, Project Manager for the General Plan, and Ron Schafer, Angeles District Superintendent, were present to answer specific questions on the proposed plan. He concluded by requesting that the Commission adopt the draft resolution to approve the general plan.

Chair Shriver asked if the commissioners had any questions for Mr. Matsumoto or Superintendent Schafer at this time. There being none, the Chair noted that given the large number of registered speakers on this item he would limit each speaker to two minutes. He then called the first 24 of 36 speakers who had registered to speak on this agenda item. The Chair called for a break at 10:43 a.m.

Chair Shriver reconvened the meeting at 10:56 a.m. He proceeded to call the remaining 12 of 36 speakers
on this item. During the public comment Chair Shriver called staff’s attention to several issues raised by speakers, including concerns pertaining to wildfires, an equestrian staging area, and parking. He took particular notice of statistics provided by Superintendent Woody Smeck of the National Park Service. Superintendent Smeck stated that the National Park Service had been collecting data since 1922, and that during that time there had not been a single reported incident of a campfire being responsible for starting a wildfire. The Chair requested that those in the audience not make comments or criticize the speakers.

Chair Shriver closed public comment on agenda item 5A at 11:18 a.m. The Chair then asked Director Coleman and her staff to respond to issues that had been raised by the public speakers.

Director Coleman explained that she would have staff subject matter experts respond to each issue. The Director responded to concerns related to the funding of projects at Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park, explaining that the proposed general plan had been paid for by mitigation funds provided by Southern California Edison. She explained that this had been a privately financed general plan, an example of creative funding for State Parks projects. Director Coleman further explained that the development projects proposed in the general plan would be bond-financed, adding that no development would be likely to take place until there had been a successful bond measure to provide funding. The Director also clarified that no development could take place without an approved general plan and additional environmental impact reports for the development projects.

Angeles District Superintendent Ron Schafer responded to the concerns pertaining to wildfires. Superintendent Schafer described California State Parks’ experience with camping in areas where fire was a concern. He explained how the location of the proposed campground at Santa Susana State Historic Park had been changed in response to stakeholder concerns. The Superintendent also reiterated the statistical data provided by Robert Taylor of the National Park Service during the Commission’s briefing in the park on the previous day which was presented again by Woody Smeck of the National Park Service at today’s meeting. This National Park Service data provided no evidence to indicate that a wildfire had ever started in a developed campground. Superintendent Schafer explained the rules, restrictions, and enforcement of California State Parks’ three-tiered fire program. He also explained that the California Department of Forestry reports concerning wildfires started by campfires failed to indicate that the Department of Forestry’s definition of a campfire included fires in what would be considered backcountry areas and illegal campfires, neither of which are the same as developed campsite. Superintendent Schafer reiterated that there was no record of a developed campground being the source of a wildfire. He added that plans were in place to have two dedicated staff members to support this park.

Barney Matsumoto, Project Manager for the Santa Susana Pass General Plan, responded to concerns regarding the Rocketdyne/Santa Susana Field Laboratory site. Mr. Matsumoto explained that the proposed general plan was, as the title implied, only general. He explained that any development proposed in the general plan could not take place without first conducting additional studies and environmental impact reports. Mr. Matsumoto reiterated that a public input process and environmental review would take place before any development project was constructed in the park.

The Chair recognized Commissioner Jack Baylis, who asked Mr. Matsumoto if ground water quality tests had been conducted on the park property. Mr. Matsumoto replied that no such tests had been conducted in conjunction with the resource inventory that had been prepared for the proposed general plan.

Director Coleman then asked Angeles District Superintendent Ron Schafer to respond to the concerns expressed about parking of vehicles near the park, particularly on Andora Avenue.

Superintendent Schafer noted that Andora Avenue served as an important entry point for the park as it provided access to the historic stagecoach route. The Superintendent stated that this area had been designated as multi-use, and that the proposed general plan had been designed to accommodate a statewide constituency while ensuring that the park served as a good neighbor to local residents. He explained that the proposal to provide parking in the park, along with trash receptacles and restrooms, would reduce the
number of vehicles parking on the street. Superintendent Schafer also explained that the proposed parking lot would consist of approximately six-to-twelve parking spaces and would include a gate to close off the parking lot after dark. He added that in his 31 years of experience with California State Parks he had observed that developed areas were much easier to regulate than undeveloped areas.

Barney Matsumoto then addressed concerns related to trails and equestrian staging. Mr. Matsumoto stated that he wished to acknowledge that the general plan team had worked closely with equestrian groups to develop the proposal for equestrian staging in the Spahn Ranch area of the park. He noted that the general plan did not provide specific details regarding the development of the staging area and that further discussion would take place on this subject. Mr. Matsumoto explained that plans for equestrian staging and for trails in the park would include additional environmental impact reports, public input, and compliance with the accessibility requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Director Coleman then asked Kathryn Tobias, Senior Staff Counsel, to provide an overview of each of the staff responses to issues raised by the public speakers.

During her review Ms. Tobias asked the commissioners to refer to the general plan/final environmental impact report for Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park, as many of the issues raised by today’s speakers had already been addressed in the Master Response section of the general plan’s final environmental impact report. Ms. Tobias noted that the concerns related to wildfires were addressed in Master Response 2, and the Rocketdyne-related comments in Master Response 7, adding that pages 114 and 115 of the environmental impact report explained that prior to any development taking place at the park soil tests would be conducted to determine whether or not contamination was present. Regarding the Andora Avenue parking concerns, Ms. Tobias noted that Master Response 3 addressed the questions of access to the park and why this area had been recommended as the location for parking. She also directed the commissioners to Master Response 4 regarding traffic and parking, which noted that an independent traffic study had been performed for this project, the result of which being that no significant traffic or parking impacts had been identified. She added that the traffic study included considerations related to evacuation of the area, funeral processions traveling to and from the nearby Oakwood Memorial Park, and other traffic-related concerns. Ms. Tobias explained that the advantages of the proposed campground location and reasons for the selection of this location were provided in Master Response 2. Ms. Tobias concluded her comments by stating that California State Parks had substantial evidence in the record of the project to address each of the concerns expressed by public speakers at today’s meeting. She also stated that it was important to note that court decisions had established that substantial evidence did not include opinion, unsubstantiated or uncorroborated comments, and that it was important to make a distinction between actual California Environmental Quality Act-based concerns and general concerns related to the proposals of the general plan.

Chair Shriver thanked Ms. Tobias and asked if there were any comments or questions from the Commission. The Chair recognized Commissioner Caryl Hart.

Commissioner Hart responded to several comments made by public speakers. The Commissioner noted that campgrounds adjacent to urban areas were actually quite common in California, and, she believed, very valuable. She stated that the state bond measures of the last eight years, along with the department’s major investments in the Los Angeles area, underscored how important urban parks are to California State Parks. Commissioner Hart stated that she agreed with the speakers who emphasized the importance of the equestrian opportunities in the park and that it would be wrong to limit access for equestrians. The Commissioner noted that staging areas for equestrians should be encouraged, and that she believed it was not appropriate to combine an equestrian staging area with the purposed campground. Regarding the wildfire concerns that were expressed, Commissioner Hart stated that it should be made clear that, according to National Park Service data going back to 1922, no evidence existed that a wildfire had ever originated in a developed campground.

Chair Shriver recognized Commissioner Acquanetta Warren.
Commissioner Warren suggested that the concerns pertaining to illegal parking near the park could be addressed with proper signage. The Commissioner noted that park users may not realize their behavior is illegal and that this could be corrected through the use of signs describing the potential violations and citing the proper authority. During Commissioner Warren’s statements the sounds of children playing could be heard just outside of the meeting room. The Commissioner called the room’s attention to these sounds, saying that these children represented the future, and that it was important to instill in all children an appreciation for the valuable resources protected by and available to them in parks. Commissioner Warren indicated that those who live near state parks, including many of the public speakers present, should consider these values and think of California State Parks as a partner. The Commissioner also described the recent experience of several Malibu residents who, having been evacuated by wildfires, were allowed to live in a neighboring state park. She added that this support was provided at a sacrifice to California State Parks, which had to cancel 1,500 camping reservations in order to deploy staff to provide aid to wildfire evacuees. Commissioner Warren also noted that while there are those who abuse privileges and behave irresponsibly, the presence of proper signs and park staff would help to make the park property safer and more orderly.

Chair Shriver recognized Commissioner Paul Witt.

Commissioner Witt commented in response to speakers who expressed concerns about the quality of people that use state parks. The Commissioner stated that he and his family were frequent and regular park users, adding that his children learned to become stewards of the land and respect private property by visiting California State Parks. Commissioner Witt noted that during his frequent visits to parks, which included several in close proximity to his home, he had observed that park visitors took great pride in the parks they used, typically responding to emergency or law enforcement situations even before local residents were aware of potential issues. The Commissioner concluded that the ultimate result of the proposed park improvements would be a safer and cleaner neighborhood, rather than the opposite.

Chair Shriver recognized Commissioner Gail Kautz.

Commissioner Kautz stated that she agreed with the comments of her fellow commissioners. The Commissioner added that she took issue with the comments of the speaker who stated she did not understand how a park could be located so near to condominiums; Commissioner Kautz pointed out, to some laughter from the audience, that the park existed before the condominiums. The Commissioner added that she believed the park was a wonderful enhancement to the community. Commissioner Kautz also noted that she was a long-time equestrian and that she agreed with the comments of equestrian speakers, noting that it had been a positive suggestion to make small additions to equestrian trails as necessary to make these trails loop trails. The Commissioner also noted that proper staging areas, to allow for safe unloading and loading of horses from trailers and sufficient room to maneuver vehicles with trailers, was a very positive suggestion. Commissioner Kautz also noted, in response to a speaker who stated that if park development took place people would come to use the facilities, that people already came to the park and would continue to do so regardless of additional development. The Commissioner added that proper facilities were essential to controlling park use.

Chair Shriver recognized Commissioner Sophia Scherman.

Commissioner Scherman addressed the issue of homeless persons in the park. The Commissioner stated that the development of campgrounds and other facilities in the park, along with the related presence of park rangers, would discourage unauthorized use of the park. Commissioner Scherman noted that the presence of park rangers would also contribute to the general order of things in the area, helping to control dogs off-lease, illegal fires, parking, etc. The Commissioner encouraged those who objected to the construction of parking lots and restrooms to consider that for many park visitors, especially persons with disabilities, such facilities were essential to these persons’ enjoyment of the park. She noted that each development project in the park would offer additional opportunities for public comment and she encouraged those attending today’s meeting to remain involved. Commissioner Scherman added that California
State Parks would like park neighbors to feel comfortable and safe because of the park in their community. The Commissioner also stated that she appreciated the comments of the speakers who showed their support for preserving the park’s cultural resources. Commissioner Scherman related that she had been asked where members of the Commission lived. She stated in response that the commissioners came from all over California, that their composition was quite well-balanced, and that each commissioner had a great passion for parks. Commissioner Scherman thanked the speakers for their participation.

Chair Shriver joked that he would not address the well-balanced nature of the Commission. There being no further questions, Chair Shriver stated that he wished to clarify several points that had been made by commissioners. The Chair addressed Senior Staff Counsel Kathryn Tobias. He noted that as commissioners had made several points with regard to the proposed general plan, the Chair wished to clarify whether or not the Commission’s approval of the plan would then be contingent on these comments.

Ms. Tobias replied that the comments made by commissioners would become part of the administrative record of the Commission meeting to approve the general plan for Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park. She explained that unless specifically directed to do so, staff would not actually incorporate such comments into the general plan. Chair Shriver asked Ms. Tobias to confirm that as part of the administrative record, the comments made by commissioners would have an effect on the implementation of the general plan, and that they could be referenced, for example, by someone looking for clarification of these comments at some point in the future. Ms. Tobias replied that the comments could be referenced in this way.

Chair Shriver then asked if there was a motion to adopt the resolution before the Commission to approve the preliminary general plan and environmental impact report for Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park.

Motion Commissioner Witt, second Commissioner Hart. The Commissioners voted unanimously to adopt the resolution to approve the preliminary general plan and environmental impact report for Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park.

Chair Shriver then recognized Angeles District Superintendent Ron Schafer.

Superintendent Schafer stated that Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park had been a long time in the making, with many individuals responsible for the park’s existence and completion of the general plan. He noted that 2,100 signatures had been collected to establish the park, and that major roles had been played by the Santa Susana Mountain Park Association, the Chatsworth Historical Society, and the City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation & Parks. Superintendent Schafer expressed thanks to Ms. Laurie Dager and the many members of these organizations for their efforts and considerable support.

ITEM 5B:
Consideration and action on the Department’s recommendation to rename San Simeon State Park as Hearst San Simeon State Park

Chair Shriver asked Dan Ray, Chief of State Parks’ Planning Division, to present this item to the Commission. Mr. Ray noted that this proposal arose out of the Commission’s action to combine William Randolph Hearst Memorial State Beach with San Simeon State Park, which took place at the Commission’s August 24th, 2007 meeting in Morro Bay. He briefly described some of the reasons for California State Parks’ support of this proposal: The Hearst name had long been associated with this portion of San Luis Obispo County, the addition of the Hearst name, already in use at Hearst Castle, would make the park more accessible to tourists, and in recognition of the large portions of park property that had made available by the Hearst family. Mr. Ray asked that the commissioners adopt the resolution before them to rename San Simeon State Park as Hearst San Simeon State Park.

Chair Shriver asked if the commissioners had any questions for Mr. Ray. There being none, the Chair called three speakers who had registered to speak on this agenda item.

Chair Shriver closed public comment on agenda item 5B at 11:55 a.m. The Chair then opened this item for discussion by the Commission.
Commissioner Jack Baylis stated that he wished to thank the Hearst family, and Steve Hearst in particular, for their leadership that had been provided to the Hearst Ranch Conservation Project.

Commissioner Gail Kautz noted that regardless of how one personally regarded the Hearst family, when tourists visit this area they go to “Hearst Castle.” The Commissioner stated that she believed it was very helpful to utilize the Hearst name when identifying this area.

Chair Shriver noted that there were no other comments from Commissioners. The Chair then stated that he agreed with Commissioner Kautz’s comments, as he had mentioned at the Commission’s August meeting in Morro Bay. Chair Shriver stated that from a marketing standpoint, especially with so many people searching for information and destinations on the Internet, connecting the Hearst name with San Simeon State Park was especially valuable. He noted that he was very supportive of this proposal, not only because of the Hearst family’s involvement but for its importance in marketing the park as a destination for people around the world.

Chair Shriver then asked if there was a motion on this agenda item. Motion Commissioner Kautz, second Commissioner Warren. The Commissioners voted unanimously to adopt the resolution to rename San Simeon State Park as Hearst San Simeon State Park.

ITEM 5C:
Consent Items

Chair Shriver announced that he had received a request to remove one of the proposed concession items from consent. Before considering these items the Chair requested clarification from staff regarding the authority to remove items from consent. General Counsel Bradly Torgan replied that members of the public could request that items be pulled from consent but that a member of the Commission must concur with the request for this to take place.

Commissioner Jack Baylis stated that he wished to remove agenda item 5C, III, concerning Pacheco State Park, from consent.

ITEM 5C-I:
Determination that the concession contract for various tours and food services at Angel Island State Park is compatible with the classification and approved general plan for this unit

ITEM 5C-II:
Determination that the concession contract for various marina operations at Lake Oroville State Recreation Area is compatible with the classification and approved general plan for this unit

ITEM 5C-IV:
Concurrence on the Director’s appointment of Linda Guillis to the Board of Directors of the California Citrus State Historic Park Non-Profit Management Corporation

Chair Shriver noted that the Commission would now consider agenda items 5C, I, II, and IV, and that agenda item 5C, III would be discussed and considered separately. The Chair noted that no members of the public had indicated they wished to speak regarding items 5C, I, II, and IV. There being no comments from the commissioners the Chair asked for a motion to approve these items. The motion was made by Commissioner Scherman, second Commissioner Kautz. The commissioners voted unanimously to make a determination that the concession contract for various tours and food services at Angel Island State Park is compatible with the classification and approved general plan for this unit, that the concession contract for various marina operations at Lake Oroville State Recreation Area is compatible with the classification and approved general plan for this unit, and to concur on the Director’s appointment of Linda Guillis to the Board of Directors of the California Citrus State Historic Park Non-Profit Management Corporation.
ITEM 5C-III:
Determination that the concession contract for operation of the wind-powered electrical generation facility at Pacheco State Park is compatible with the classification and approved general plan for this unit

Chair Shriver then introduced Commissioner Jack Baylis, who represented the Commission’s Concessions, Enterprise & Fiscal Committee, to explain why he removed this item from consent.

Commissioner Baylis explained that while California State Parks staff had done a good job of presenting this item to the committee, the committee believed the issues of alternative energy and windpower generation at Pacheco State Park warranted involvement of the entire Commission.

Chair Shriver acknowledged Commissioner Baylis’ explanation and noted that a member of the public had expressed a desire to speak on this item. The Chair called on Mr. Dennis Fox. Mr. Fox clarified that he wished to speak on agenda item 5C, II, but that his questions were actually funding related. Mr. Fox indicated that he would wait for the Open Public Comment agenda item, but the Chair offered that Mr. Fox could speak now if he wished. Mr. Fox posed two questions related to state park funding.

Director Ruth Coleman responded to Mr. Fox’s questions. She explained that revenue from concessions at state park units was applied to the State Park and Recreation Fund and commingled with revenue from visitor fees. Director Coleman stated that these funds were employed to support all units of the State Park System and that they were not applied to any specific unit or project.

Chair Shriver then returned to agenda item 5C, III. He asked staff to respond to Commissioner Baylis’ comments. Director Coleman noted that Jim Luscutoff, Chief of California State Parks’ Concessions, Reservations, and Fees Division, would respond.

Mr. Luscutoff explained that the proposal before the Commission was a request to approve compatibility of the wind turbine contract with the general plan for Pacheco State Park. He added that the general plan for Pacheco State Park had been approved about two years previously and that a determination had been made at that time that the concession was compatible with the park’s general plan. Mr. Luscutoff explained that the current request was related to a budget change proposal that State Parks must submit to the state legislature for approval. He noted that in conjunction with the preparation of the budget change proposal State Parks would be conducting a feasibility study to provide direction for the project – to determine the optimum size of the project, the number of windmills, etc., and serve as a guide to State Parks in preparing a request for proposals which would ultimately be put out to bid.

Chair Shriver asked for confirmation that the requested action was a determination of whether or not the proposal was compatible with the park’s existing general plan; a compatibility finding. Mr. Luscutoff replied that this was correct.

Chair Shriver recognized Commissioner Caryl Hart.

Commissioner Hart agreed that it was important to remove this item from the consent calendar. The Commissioner stated that in general wind turbines at a state park would be an inconsistent use. She also stated that it was important to recognize that the wind turbines were on the property when it was acquired by California State Parks, and that the wind turbines were, she believed, a condition of the acquisition of the property. The Commissioner noted that the situation was unique, and that Commission approval of this proposal should be conditional in that it would not allow for any expansion of the current wind farm. She added that any proposed expansion should be brought before the Commission for approval.

Commissioner Jack Baylis reiterated that he wished to ensure that the full Commission understood the various facts of the project: the efficiency of the turbines currently in use, how this project compares to other wind farms, etc. Commissioner Baylis noted that there were many complex issues to be considered in a project of this type and he asked Jim Luscutoff to provide an update to the Commission once the feasibility study for the project had been completed.
Chair Shriver asked for clarification that State Parks was not planning to acquire the wind farm, but to create a new the lease for the wind farm operator. Mr. Luscutoff replied that this was correct and that the current lease would be expiring in approximately one year.

Chair Shriver stated that with regard to the compatibility determination he did not believe that he had sufficient information to make this decision. The Chair acknowledged that the wind farm represented a historic use of the park. Chair Shriver also noted that he agreed with Commissioner Baylis that State Parks should develop standards so that the department is prepared should it be approached at some future time with a proposal to develop another wind farm on park property.

A discussion took place during which Commissioners Baylis and Hart, Chair Shriver, and Director Coleman discussed the lease for operation of the wind farm and the approved general plan’s (approved by the State Park and Recreation Commission on May 12, 2006) explicit authorization of the wind farm. Director Coleman clarified that the action before the Commission was a determination of whether or not the existence of the windmills at Pacheco State Park was consistent with the park’s general plan. Chair Shriver noted that as the park’s approved general plan specifically allowed for the wind farm a compatibility determination had, in essence, already been made. Commissioner Hart stated that the Commission should have more information on the subject and that they should review the language of the approved general plan. Director Coleman explained there was an immediate need for project approval in the state legislature given the constraints of the legislative budget cycle. She asked Jim Luscutoff to explain.

Mr. Luscutoff explained that because of the legislative cycle it was important to obtain approval for this project as soon as possible. He noted that the park’s general plan specifies that size of the wind farm will be reduced by nearly 50 percent, from the current 4,000 acres to slightly more than 2,000 acres. Mr. Luscutoff described other unique “existing use” situations inherited by California State Parks when acquiring park property, adding that the continued existence of the Pacheco State Park wind farm did not set a precedent for developing wind farms in other State Park System units. He explained that approval of this action by the Commission would allow the project to proceed through the budget process and ensure the completion of the project’s feasibility study.

A discussion took place amongst Chair Shriver, Mr. Luscutoff, and Commissioner Warren concerning the probable changes to the existing wind farm: That there are currently 167 wind turbines, but that by incorporating new technology this number would likely be reduced along with the overall footprint of the wind farm. Commissioner Warren also noted that with 10 percent of the revenue from the wind farms going toward the operation of Pacheco State Park the continuation of the wind farm was an important aspect of sustaining the park. Commissioner Warren suggested that the commissioners accept the project as an existing use.

Bradly Torgan, State Parks General Counsel, Commissioners Hart and Warren, Chair Shriver, and Jim Luscutoff discussed the fiscal ramifications of the project and the possible result should the Commission fail to approve the proposed action today. Commissioner Hart replied that rather than jeopardize the project during the budget process she would prefer to approve the project based on staff findings that the wind farm is consistent with the park’s general plan. The commissioners acknowledged that the potential impact to the operation of Pacheco State Park was $180,000.00 per year. Mr. Torgan added that the proposed action pertained only to the existing facility, and that should the feasibility study recommend substantial changes to the size or scope of the existing project a general plan amendment, and therefore Commission approval, may be required.

Commissioner Jack Baylis submitted a motion that the Commission approve the proposed action contingent on the commissioners receiving additional information regarding the viability of the present concession arrangement for the wind farm.

General Counsel Bradly Torgan requested clarification that the intent of Commissioner Baylis’ motion was to postpone a decision until the next meeting. Commissioner Baylis confirmed that this was correct.
Chair Shriver and Commissioners Hart and Witt discussed the motion and the repercussions of postponing a decision on this matter.

Commissioner Baylis suggested a friendly amendment to his own motion, recommending that the Commission’s Concession, Enterprise, and Fiscal Committee could become involved with the process by meeting with Mr. Luscutoff prior to the next Commission meeting.

Mr. Luscutoff and Director Coleman clarified that a budget change proposal for this project had already been submitted to the California Department of Finance and the state legislature. Director Coleman explained that the Legislative Analyst’s Office typically recommended denial of concession proposals that had not first received the approval of the State Park and Recreation Commission. She added that failure to receive Commission approval at this time would likely result in the project having to wait for the following year’s legislative calendar, a delay of almost an entire year. Mr. Luscutoff noted that he would keep the commissioners informed of the progress of the feasibility study.

Chair Shriver requested clarification that the action before the Commission was a legal finding of compatibility of the project with the park’s general plan. The Chair discussed with General Counsel Bradly Torgan, Commissioner Baylis, Jim Luscutoff, and Chief Deputy Paul Romero the reasons for this decision being brought to the Commission when the park’s general plan – which permitted the wind farm – had been approved in May 2006. Mr. Luscutoff explained that the project was unique in having already been approved in the general plan, though the concession process required the proposal for a new contract to be brought before the Commission for yet another determination of compatibility with the general plan.

Commissioner Baylis noted that the wind farm was unique and unfamiliar to commissioners. He requested that the Commission be involved with the project’s feasibility study and the subsequent request for proposals. Mr. Torgan stated that staff’s intention was to present the project’s feasibility study to the Commission, and to communicate with the Commission regarding the project’s request for proposal process.

Commissioner Baylis clarified that his intent was to ensure that staff work closely with the Commission throughout the process of developing this concession, to allow the commissioners to obtain an understanding of all aspects of the project: the fiscal, environmental, and people-based impacts.

Chair Shriver, Mr. Luscutoff, and Commissioners Baylis and Warren discussed the requirement for State Parks to bring concessions with annual gross sales in excess of $500,000.00 to the Commission for a determination of compatibility with park unit general plans. Mr. Luscutoff explained that the total gross revenue generated by the wind farm lease was approximately $2.1 million per year, of which California State Parks received 10 percent after the deduction of certain allowable expenses.

Commissioner Gail Kautz asked if other contractors could become involved with the new lease. Mr. Luscutoff and Chair Shriver replied that the current lease existed at the time the park property was acquired by State Parks, and that the current proposal would permit the establishment of a request for proposals process that would allow changes, including allowing other contractors to submit proposals to operate the wind farm under a new lease.

Commissioner Hart noted that the motion should be restated.

Commissioner Baylis restated his motion. He moved that the Commission make a determination of compatibility with the understanding that the project’s feasibility study would be brought to the Commission, at which time a determination would be made regarding the project’s request for proposals. Commissioner Baylis reiterated that his intention was to involve the Commission in every step of this concession’s approval process so long as this did not delay the project and would allow the Commission to stop the project at any point if desired. Director Coleman clarified that Commissioner Baylis’ motion was that the Commission make a determination of compatibility with the park’s general plan on the condition that once the feasibility study is complete it be presented to the Commission for their involvement in the decision of whether or not to proceed with issuing requests for proposals.
Chair Shriver seconded Commissioner Baylis’ motion.

Commissioners Hart and Kautz asked if this motion would permit the project to proceed within the available timeline. Director Coleman and Mr. Luscutoff replied that this would be the case.

Chair Shriver then called for a vote on Commissioner Baylis’ motion (second Chair Shriver). Commissioners Baylis, Hart, Kautz, Scherman, Shriver, and Witt voted yes to the motion. Commissioner Warren voted no. The motion passed six-to-one, stating that the Commission had made a determination that the concession contract for operation of the wind-powered electrical generation facility at Pacheco State Park was compatible with the classification and approved general plan for this unit.

Chair Shriver asked Commissioner Acquanetta Warren to explain her no vote for the record.

Commissioner Warren stated that with the present concerns pertaining to the budget, park maintenance and revenue, she did not find it necessary to create extra work for staff on this project. Commissioner Warren noted that she had an understanding of the feasibility study and request for proposals process and that she believed it would have been sufficient to accept the staff recommendation regarding this action.

Chair Shriver thanked Commissioner Warren for her comments and announced the next agenda item.

AGENDA ITEM 6:
OPEN PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Shriver explained that he would only entertain matters under the Commission’s jurisdiction. The Chair noted that given the number of speakers on the earlier agenda items and the lateness of the day he would appreciate speakers’ restricting themselves to subjects under the authority of the Commission. The Chair then called four speakers in the order they had registered to speak, noting that Mr. Robert Garcia had to depart and was no longer present. At this time Chair Shriver also noted that Commissioner Acquanetta Warren must be excused to attend a prior appointment. The four speakers were:

Reverend Donn Ragle, concerning camping fees for park chaplains.

Ruth Gerson, concerning support for funding of an equestrian campground in Malibu Creek State Park.

Jim Hasenauer, concerning the current budget situation, public participation and efforts to keep parks and trails open.

Diana Dixon-Davis, concerning the current budget situation and public involvement in keeping parks open.

Chair Shriver closed Open Public Comment at 12:31 p.m. There being no comments from Commissioners, the Chair announced that the Commission would take a short break before reconvening in closed session.

AGENDA ITEM 7:
CLOSED SESSION TO DISCUSS PENDING LITIGATION

Closed Session to discuss pending litigation as permitted by Government Code section 11126, subdivision (e)(2)(A). People of the State of California, ex rel. Attorney General Bill Lockyer and State Park and Recreation Commission v. Foothill/Eastern Transportation Corridor Agency, a joint powers authority; Board of Directors of the Foothill/Eastern Transportation Corridor Agency (San Diego Superior Court Case No. GIN 051371)

Chair Shriver reconvened the Commission in closed session at 12:37 p.m.

AGENDA ITEM 8:
PUBLIC ACCOUNT OF REPORTABLE ITEMS, IF ANY, FROM CLOSED SESSION

Chair Shriver reconvened the Commission in open session at 12:43 p.m. There were no reportable actions from the closed session.
AGENDA ITEM 9:  
ADJOURNMENT

Chair Shriver asked if there were any additional comments or questions from commissioners or staff.  
Chief Deputy Paul Romero announced that the next Commission meeting would take place on May 15-16,  
2008, in Mendocino County. There being no further comments or questions from the Commission, Chair  
Shriver adjourned the meeting at 12:44 p.m.  

ATTEST:  These minutes were approved by the California State Park and Recreation Commission on May  
16, 2008, at its duly-noticed public meeting in Chatsworth, California.  

By: __________________________ Date: ________  
Louis Nastro  
Assistant to the Commission  
For Ruth Coleman, Director  
California Department of Parks and Recreation  
Secretary to the Commission  

O R I G I N A L S I G N E D B Y 5-16-08
Meeting of the
CALIFORNIA STATE PARK AND RECREATION COMMISSION
Education Building at the Church at Rocky Peak
22601 Santa Susana Pass Road, Chatsworth, California
Friday, February 29, 2008 - 9:00 a.m.

Agenda of the Meeting

1. Approval of minutes of the August 24th, 2007 meeting in Morro Bay
2. Chair’s Report/Recognitions
   A. Recognition of employee retirements
3. Approval of Special Redwood Groves - Save-the-Redwoods League
4. Director’s Report
   A. Discussion of operational and funding questions raised during the February 1st meeting
5. Public Hearing
   A. Consideration and action on the Department’s recommendation to approve the preliminary general plan & environmental impact report for Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park
   B. Consideration and action on the Department’s recommendation to rename San Simeon State Park as Hearst San Simeon State Park
   C. Consent Items (reflecting staff recommendations)
      I. Determination that the concession contract for various tours and food services at Angel Island State Park is compatible with the classification and approved general plan for this unit
      II. Determination that the concession contract for various marina operations at Lake Oroville State Recreation Area is compatible with the classification and approved general plan for this unit
      III. Determination that the concession contract for operation of the wind-powered electrical generation facility at Pacheco State Park is compatible with the classification and approved general plan for this unit
      IV. Concurrence on the Director’s appointment of Linda Guillis to the Board of Directors of the California Citrus State Historic Park Non-Profit Management Corp.
6. Open Public Comment (on subjects other than the above agenda items)
7. Closed Session to discuss pending litigation as permitted by Government Code section 11126, subdivision (e)(2)(A). People of the State of California, ex rel. Attorney General Bill Lockyer and State Park and Recreation Commission v. Foothill/Eastern Transportation Corridor Agency, a joint powers authority; Board of Directors of the Foothill/Eastern Transportation Corridor Agency (San Diego Superior Court Case No. GIN 051371). Members of the public should note that the meeting room will be cleared during the closed session.
8. Public account of reportable items, if any, from closed session
9. Adjourn