

# **CALIFORNIA STATE PARK and RECREATION COMMISSION**

Santa Rosa Veterans Memorial Building  
1351 Maple Avenue  
Santa Rosa, California

## **Minutes of the Meeting - Friday, May 14, 2004**

### **COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**

Joseph Cotchett  
Caryl Hart, Chair  
Clint Eastwood  
Gail Kautz  
Sophia Scherman  
Bobby Shriver  
Phillip Tagami  
Paul Junger Witt

### **COMMISSIONERS ABSENT**

Raquelle de la Rocha, Vice Chair

### **STATE PARKS STAFF PRESENT**

Dave Boyd, Senior State Park Resource Ecologist  
Ruth Coleman, Director  
Rosario Cortés, Assistant Director of Legislation  
John Crossman, Superintendent, Silverado Sector  
Grace Daniel, Deputy Director, Partnerships and Economic Development  
Keith Demetrak, Chief, Planning Division  
Robin Ettinger, Project Manager, Sugarloaf Ridge State Park General Plan  
Bob Hare, Project Manager, Tomales Bay State Park General Plan  
Tim La Franchi, Chief Counsel  
Dave Matthews, Supervising State Park Ranger, Marin Sector  
Joe Mette, Superintendent, North Bay District  
Don Monahan, Superintendent, Diablo Vista District  
Louis Nastro, Assistant to the State Park and Recreation Commission  
Rick Rayburn, Chief, Natural Resources Division  
Roy Stearns, Deputy Director, Communications  
Jay Walsh, Special Assistant to the Director

### **SPEAKERS REGISTERED/REPRESENTING**

Craig Anderson, LandPaths  
Tom Baty, Individual  
Gordon Bennett, Sierra Club  
Patti Dunton, Salinan Tribe  
Caroline Dutton, Individual  
Chris Elliott, One Cool Earth  
Kara Hagedorn, Individual  
Elizabeth Hugill, Sonoma County Horse Council

Scott Kivel, Individual  
Brenda Landau, Individual  
Andrea MacKenzie, Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation & Open Space District  
Steve Mattieu, Individual  
Michael Mery, Individual  
Steve Perry, Individual  
Philip Sales, Sonoma County Regional Parks Department  
Donna Sheehan, Individual  
George Stanton, Individual  
Dee Swanhuysen, Bay Area Ridge Trail Council  
Kenneth Switras, Individual  
Candace Vittitow, Individual  
Ken Wells, Sonoma County Trails Council  
Betty Winholtz, Individual

### **CALL TO ORDER**

Legal notice having been given, the California State Park and Recreation Commission meeting was called to order at 9:39 a.m. by Chair Caryl Hart. Chair Hart introduced the commissioners present as well as State Parks Director Ruth Coleman.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE FEBRUARY 27, 2004 MEETING IN DANA POINT**

Chair Hart asked if there were any changes to the draft minutes of the of February 27, 2004 meeting in Dana Point. Commissioner Kautz noted one correction to the minutes, that she no longer served on the Commission on Improving Life Through Service as was noted in Director Coleman's introductions on page 2 of the draft minutes. Chair Hart noted this correction and directed the Assistant to the Commission to make this change. Chair Hart then asked for a motion to approve the minutes as corrected. Motion Commissioner Tagami, second Commissioner Scherman. The commissioners voted unanimously to approve the minutes with the one change as noted.

### **DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Chair Hart called on State Parks Director Ruth Coleman to present her Director's Report.

**New appointments at State Parks** – Director Coleman welcomed all to the meeting and noted that eight commissioners were present for the first time in many years (the ninth commissioner was absent because of a medical emergency). Director Coleman then noted that in addition to having filled the open seats on the State Park and Recreation Commission, Governor Schwarzenegger had made appointments to all of the exempt executive-level positions at State Parks. State Parks was the first department in all of California government to have these positions filled by the new governor. Director Coleman noted that State Parks was honored to be the recipient of this attention.

Director Coleman then introduced the new appointees, some of whom were present: Paul Romero is the new Chief Deputy Director. Mr. Romero will start with State Parks in July. Mr. Romero previously served as Chief Administrative Officer for the Santa Clara Water District, and as the Director of the Santa Clara County Parks and Recreation Department. Grace Daniel is State Parks' new Deputy Director for Partnerships and Economic Development. Ms. Daniel previously served as a principal of Golden State Management and Marketing Services, and as a member of the California Agriculture Labor Relations Board. The new Deputy Director of the Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Division is Daphne Greene, formerly the owner of an adventure consulting company called Twin Day, which manages off-highway vehicle education programs for vehicle manufacturers. Ms. Greene is also a former chair of State Parks' Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation Commis-

sion. Rosario Cortés is State Parks' new Assistant Deputy for Legislation. Ms. Cortés' experience includes working as a legislative advocate with the firm Nossaman, Guthner, Knox and Elliot, and as a legislative analyst with the Association of California Water Agencies. Wayne Donaldson, a nationally-recognized architect and expert in historic preservation, is State Parks' new State Historic Preservation Officer. Jay Walsh, who most recently served as a national account manager for the start-up Air-Paq, is the newly-appointed Special Assistant to the Director.

**Budget** – Director Coleman reported that there had been no changes in State Parks' budget since her last report to the Commission in February. She reminded the commissioners that State Parks would be implementing user fee increases, but that the department's base budget would not be changed. She further noted that the Governor's May Revise did not make any changes to State Parks' budget.

**California's Remarkable Women Exhibit** – Director Coleman reported that just two days previously State Parks celebrated the opening in Sacramento of the "California's Remarkable Women" exhibit spearheaded by First Lady Maria Shriver. Director Coleman described the impressive achievement of State Parks staff in designing and installing this outstanding exhibit in just four-and-a-half months, an accomplishment that would typically take a year to complete. Director Coleman explained that the exhibit commemorates the achievements of California women, and that it occupies 3,000 square feet in the California History Museum operated by the Secretary of State. She noted that it is an exciting and inspirational exhibit and she recommended that everyone make a point of visiting it.

**New Executive Director for California State Parks Foundation** – Director Coleman introduced Elizabeth Goldstein as the new Executive Director of the California State Parks Foundation. Director Coleman explained that the California State Parks Foundation is an essential partner to State Parks, and that the Foundation's over 40,000 members serve as an independent, statewide voice for California State Parks. Director Coleman explained that Ms. Goldstein had most recently served as Director of Parks for the City and County of San Francisco, and that her experience included serving as Regional Director of the National Trust for Historic Preservation and as Regional Director of the New York City Region of New York State Parks and Recreation and Historic Preservation. Director Coleman then invited Ms. Goldstein to address the Commission.

Ms. Goldstein expressed her pleasure in having an opportunity to speak to the Commission. She noted that she had previously worked with many commissions at different levels of government, on both the east and west coasts of the United States, and that she was therefore very aware of the commitment the commissioners had made. She thanked them for their participation and hard work. Ms. Goldstein noted that she would be starting as Executive Director for the California State Parks Foundation on June 7th. She also noted that she was aware that the commissioners were active supporters of the Foundation, and she thanked them for their donations, time, and energy.

Ms. Goldstein stated that the nearly 50,000 members of the Foundation provided an extraordinary base on which to make a case to the State Legislature about the importance of State Parks. She noted that the Foundation's second annual Park Advocacy Day brought about 400 participants to Sacramento to visit 91 legislators, and that the Foundation had recently completed Earth Day celebrations all over the state of California, including an event where 500 volunteers helped with restoration of wildfire damage at Cuyamaca Rancho State Park.

Ms. Goldstein stated that the Foundation had been working with a broad coalition of environmental organizations on Senate Bill 1327 to amend the Public Resources Code to establish a process for public review of proposed activities that could be incompatible with park units. Ms. Goldstein closed by stating that in her career with three different government agencies she had worked very hard to be a good government partner to non-profit organizations that supported their respective park systems, and that this provided her with many ideas about what it means to be a good partner. She also noted that she is already a partner to State Parks in her position as a Board Member of the Angel

Island Immigration Station Foundation, and that she had worked successfully with the Friends of Recreation and Parks to renovate and reopen the Conservatory of Flowers in Golden Gate Park in San Francisco. Ms. Goldstein stated that important partnerships like these provided government agencies the flexibility and inspiration to dream and achieve more than what government could do by itself. Ms. Goldstein stated that it was her desire that the Foundation and State Parks dream together, to open doors and think creatively. Ms. Goldstein thanked the commissioners and State Parks for the opportunity to serve as their partner.

Chair Hart noted that it was nice to meet Ms. Goldstein, thanked her for her comments and noted that she too was excited about the opportunities ahead. Chair Hart also noted that the Commission would be selecting a member to act as liaison to the California State Parks Foundation, and that she hoped this commissioner could attend the Foundation's next meeting in July.

**California Recreation Policy** – Director Coleman then introduced Keith Demetrak, Chief of State Parks' Planning Division, to address the commissioners concerning their statutory responsibility pertaining to the development of California's Statewide Recreation Policy.

Mr. Demetrak explained that his presence today was a follow-up to Director Coleman's letter to the Commission of April 30th advising them of the current project to update the California Recreation Policy. Mr. Demetrak further noted that Public Resources Code Section 540B required the Commission to formulate and recommend to the Director a comprehensive recreational policy for the state. He also explained that this policy was not just for use by the State Park System or the Department of Parks and Recreation, but for all park and recreation providers in California. Mr. Demetrak provided a brief history of the California Recreation Policy, its evolution and various iterations, and the timeliness of the current update to the policy.

Mr. Demetrak noted that the policy provides guidance to State Parks and others when reviewing legislation and public policies, and that it also is used by the local agencies in the development of new city or county parks and recreation departments. He also noted that as part of the California Outdoor Recreation Program (CORP), the policy will be inspected by the National Parks Service, and that it will serve to establish California's eligibility to receive Land and Water Conservation Fund grants. Mr. Demetrak also stated that the policy could be issued as a stand-alone document signed by the Governor, and that as such it could better position parks and recreation throughout the state for involvement with discussions on important issues like after school programs, the current epidemic in childhood and adult obesity, diabetes, and at-risk youth.

Mr. Demetrak stated that development of the policy would follow established planning practices, and that as part of this process an oversight committee would be established. He asked that the Commission designate a liaison to this oversight committee. Once an initial draft policy had been created, the Commission would then be asked to conduct two or three workshops throughout the state to hear public testimony on the policy. Once a final draft has been prepared, State Parks would present this to the Commission's Policy Committee for approval and recommendation to the Director. He asked if there were any questions.

Chair Hart stated that she had served as Commission Policy Liaison in the past, and that she had been attending State Parks' Program, Policy and Planning Committee (PPPC) meetings. She recommended this service to the other commissioners and noted that the Commission played an important role in the development of the Statewide Recreation Policy.

Commissioner Tagami noted that a discussion of Commission committees appeared later on today's agenda, and he suggested selecting a recreation policy committee representative at that time. Chair Hart agreed that this was the best way to proceed.

Mr. Demetrak added that a related project to develop park and recreation standards was currently underway, and that it would probably be appropriate to combine this project with the recreation

policy at some point. A brief discussion ensued, in which Director Coleman and Mr. Demetrak discussed this and the Commission's participation in these two projects.

**Managing Eucalyptus Trees in State Park System Units** – Director Coleman introduced Rick Rayburn, Chief of State Parks' Natural Resources Division, to make a presentation on the management of eucalyptus trees in State Park System units.

Mr. Rayburn described State Parks' philosophy in managing non-native eucalyptus trees, and the number of identified negative impacts eucalyptus can have on wildlands. He also explained that in managing vegetation (eucalyptus), State Parks was also managing the fauna that is dependent on that vegetation. He then introduced Dave Boyd, registered professional forester and State Parks' Senior Resource Ecologist for Marin and Sonoma Counties, to make a presentation on State Parks experiences with the Angel Island Eucalyptus Restoration Project at Angel Island State Park.

While Mr. Boyd readied his slide presentation, Chair Hart noted that she would like to thank several individuals and agencies: Phillip Sales and Jim Angelo of Sonoma County Regional Parks, Don Monahan, Diablo Vista District Superintendent, and John Crossman, Sector Superintendent and host for the Commission's site briefing at Sugarloaf Ridge State Park, Marla Hastings and Karen Barrett of State Parks, and the Valley of the Moon Interpretive Association, especially Angie and Dennis Nowicki, for the Commission's dinner at Sugarloaf Ridge State Park.

Mr. Boyd narrated a slide presentation documenting the before-and-after effects of the presence of eucalyptus trees on Angel Island. He presented information on the history of eucalyptus on the island, the competitive advantage held by non-native species, and how the U.S. Army's original planting of 24 acres of trees had grown to 86 acres. Mr. Boyd also discussed the fire hazard posed by blue gum eucalyptus and State Parks' concern for protecting the historic (some as old as Civil War-era) structures on the island, adding that there is no fire department on the island. He also described the impact of heavily-forested areas on the park visitor experience at the island, State Parks' project to remove the eucalyptus, and the department's high level of satisfaction with this project.

Director Coleman thanked Dave Boyd for his presentation, and asked him to take questions from the Commission.

A discussion followed in which Commissioners Cotchett and Eastwood inquired about the costs and other details related to removing eucalyptus trees from Angel Island. Mr. Boyd and Mr. Rayburn provided that the project had been underway in various forms since 1991. They explained that the U.S. Army had been planting eucalyptus trees on Angel Island from 1880 until approximately 1920, they described the various methods employed to remove trees from the island, and provided details of the habitat restoration objectives of the project. They concluded that the total cost of the project to remove the trees was approximately \$400,000.

Commissioner Cotchett asked if there existed at State Parks a program to eliminate eucalyptus trees statewide, and if this was related to the removal of trees from Morro Bay State Park. Mr. Rayburn replied that there was no program to eradicate eucalyptus trees, and he explained that the tree removal that was taking place in Morro Bay was part of a campground rehabilitation project, not a habitat restoration project as had taken place on Angel Island.

Mr. Rayburn also explained that each year approximately 1% of the Natural Resources Division budget was spent on managing eucalyptus, which resulted in two or three projects per year.

Commissioner Cotchett and Mr. Rayburn then discussed removal of trees related to the campground project in Morro Bay, the community dissatisfaction at State Parks' removal of trees there, and the various dialogues on the subject that had taken place between State Parks, and the City of Morro Bay, and the California Coastal Commission.

Commissioner Eastwood noted that while Carmel, California, where he resides, is now revered as an

“upper canopy city,” its multitude of pine trees were not native to the area, which was originally a barren bluff. He expressed his concern that restoring habitats to a specific era could, from another perspective, destroy that habitat for another era.

Mr. Rayburn explained that the classifications of State Park System units, which must be approved by the Commission, are the determining factors in natural resources management, and that State Parks’ efforts toward naturalness are committed to the highest-valued habitats that are the most sustainable. He explained that Angel Island’s situation in San Francisco Bay was unique, and that State Parks believed the habitat restoration taking place there was a worthwhile investment.

Commissioner Eastwood asked about the number of visitors Angel Island receives each year and was told there were 250,000 visitors a year.

Commissioner Kautz noted that girdling and poisoning trees were unacceptable methods for removing them. A brief discussion followed during which Mr. Rayburn explained that he had not been involved with the actual removal of trees at Morro Bay State Park and was therefore unaware of the methods employed to remove trees there. Commissioners Cotchett and Eastwood, along with Chair Hart, asked that State Parks prepare a report to the Commission on the types of herbicides and pesticides that are used in state parks.

Commissioner Cotchett addressed the Chair and the members of the public present, explaining that he and the commissioners had only the greatest appreciation for State Parks’ staff, and that the questions he had raised had been asked in the spirit of generating critical thought, so that decisions weren’t made arbitrarily.

Commissioner Scherman addressed the Chair, stating that she had visited Angel Island, and that it appeared that the removal of trees there served as an enhancement. She added that in her role as Mayor of Elk Grove, California, she was well aware of the seriousness of removing trees. Commissioner Scherman cautioned that trees should be removed with great caution, because mature trees were impossible to replace.

## **CHAIR’S REPORT - RECOGNITION OF EMPLOYEE RETIREMENTS**

Chair Hart announced that the next agenda item would be the Chair’s Report and the Commission’s recognition of retiring State Parks employees. Chair Hart noted that the Commission wished to acknowledge each of the individuals named, and expressed wholehearted thanks for their incredible service to State Parks. Chair Hart then introduced Diablo Vista District Superintendent Don Monahan to read the names of State Parks employees who had retired between January 31st and March 31st of 2004:

Albert Beck .....	30 years, 3 months
Arthur P. Camacho .....	29 years, 2 months
Janet A. Carle .....	18 years, 3 months
Elzy (Carl) Drake .....	29 years, 11 months
Joann R. Ebright .....	25 years, 5 months
Susan Jones .....	33 years, 10 months
Michael Krause .....	29 years, 8 months
Fred A. Matsuura .....	20 years, 2 months
Charles Meissner .....	27 years, 2 months
Virginia A. Navarro .....	18 years, 9 months
David Van Cleve .....	31 years, 5 months
Gregory White .....	30 years, 11 months

Chair Hart thanked Superintendent Monahan, and noted the exceptionally long careers of these retirees. She again expressed her thanks to these individuals from the Commission and all of California.

Commissioner Scherman addressed the Chair, noting that a quick calculation revealed a total of over 322 years of service from these retirees. Commissioner Kautz requested that future lists of retirees include the last location where the retiree served.

## **APPROVAL OF MEMORIAL REDWOOD GROVES**

Chair Hart asked Commissioner Bobby Shriver to read the Memorial Groves as requested by Save-the-Redwoods League. Commissioner Shriver read as follows:

As Requested by Save-the-Redwoods League:

David W. Bareis Family Grove in Wilder Ranch State Park  
*Ellen R. DiGiampaolo, donor*

Charmin and David Knock Grove in Navarro River Redwoods State Park  
*L. David Knock, donor*

Commissioner Shriver made a motion that the resolutions establishing these groves be approved by the Commission. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cotchett. The commissioners voted unanimously to approve the resolutions establishing these memorial redwood groves.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

Chair Hart opened the public portion of the meeting at 10:43 a.m. Chair Hart requested that those who wished to address the Commission complete a speaker registration form. She further explained that the Chair may limit the time those addressing the Commission are allowed to speak, typically three minutes for individuals and five minutes for those representing groups.

## **Discussion on Commission Committees**

Chair Hart introduced this agenda item, noting that with all nine Commission seats filled it was now practical to discuss the formation of Commission committees. She also noted that Commissioner Tagami had expressed an interest in pursuing this subject. Chair Hart then listed the Commission Committees of the past: Affirmative Action Oversight, Bonds (which existed during times that the Commission was specifically required by statute to participate in bond expenditures), Finance and Funding Development, Gifts (Memorial Groves), Land Ownership Evaluation, Park Classification, and Policy, Programs and Resource Management.

Chair Hart also noted that the nominating committees for Commission officers had in the past been informal, and she suggested that if the rest of the commissioners approved this would remain an informal committee. The commissioners present agreed that this was acceptable. Chair Hart then introduced Commissioner Tagami to present his proposal on committees.

Commissioner Tagami stated that he had reviewed the previous committees of the Commission, and that in considering these along with the work ahead, he wished to propose that the commissioners consider the establishment of three committees, which he recommended as Audit Budget and Finance Committee, Program Policy and Legislation Committee, and Executive Committee. He also spoke briefly about his recommendations for the responsibilities of these committees, and when and how the committees should meet.

Chair Hart added that the Commission also needed to consider the appointment of a member to the California Recreation Policy Oversight Committee. Commissioner Tagami suggested that a member of the proposed Program Policy and Legislative Committee would be the appropriate liaison. Chair Hart and Commissioner Tagami discussed the duties of the proposed Executive Committee, Com-

missioner Tagami explaining that this committee would oversee scheduling and agenda management as well as some public outreach, interfacing with communities in public relations matters.

Commissioner Kautz added that the Commission also wished to establish a liaison to the California State Parks Foundation.

Chair Hart recommended that the commissioners review each of the proposed committees and the tasks they intended for these committees to accomplish. A discussion followed during which Commissioner Tagami expressed his desire to establish committees of more than two members that would conduct public meetings to solicit input to their work before reporting to the Commission. The commissioners discussed the number of members on each committee and the requisite public noticing requirements. Commissioner Shriver proposed that State Parks' Chief Counsel Tim La Franchi prepare a list of the suggested functions for each proposed committee so that the commissioners could have a better idea of where they may like to serve. Commissioner Cotchett suggested that each committee have a maximum of two members, noting that nothing would preclude these committees from conducting public meetings if they wished.

Chair Hart expressed her desire to obtain some general indications of which committees were of interest to individual commissioners. She noted that specific descriptions of the committees could be established later.

Chief Counsel La Franchi noted that the Chair could appoint and establish the committees, and appoint committee members, and that there was no requirement for this to be done by motion and vote.

Commissioner Tagami addressed the Chair, stating that he wished to revise his proposal into two separate motions. His first motion was to establish the three committees as named, establish members for those committees, and ask them to meet prior to the next meeting of the full Commission to develop a work plan. Commissioner Tagami's second motion proposed that Commission committees consist of three or more members, to encourage participation, and included a request that the committees meet a minimum of three times per year.

Chair Hart asked for a second to Commissioner Tagami's first motion to establish the three committees, and obtain a general indication of which commissioner would like to serve, with the understanding that the committee duties would be described at a later time. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Kautz.

Commissioner Shriver stated that he wished to discuss this motion. He asked for input from the staff members present; he asked if the committees would be helpful. There was no input from staff. Some good-natured joking amongst the commissioners followed.

Commissioner Scherman asked if the three new committees would encompass the duties of the eight committees that had existed in the past. Chair Hart replied that this would be the case with the exception of the Bonds Committee, as the Commission currently had no statutory authority in this area. Commissioners Scherman, Shriver, Tagami, and Chair Hart discussed where the other previous committees would fall under the new three-committee structure.

Chair Hart asked if there was any more discussion regarding the motion.

Commissioners Cotchett, Eastwood, and Scherman suggested that the process of establishing committees should be kept as simple as possible, and that the authority and structure of the committees should be left to the Commission Chair.

Commissioner Witt suggested that the Chair work informally with the commissioners to determine which two would like to serve on each of the three committees.

Chair Hart asked if Commissioner Tagami wished to amend or otherwise change his motion, or if he wished to withdraw the second part of his motion. Commissioner Tagami replied that the commis-



sioner could just vote the second part of the motion down if they wished.

Chair Hart stated that there was a motion before the Commission to establish three committees, to be described later. A motion and a second having been obtained, Chair Hart called for a vote. The commissioners voted unanimously to establish three committees: Audit Budget and Finance, Program Policy and Legislation, and Executive.

Chair Hart called for a second on Commissioner Tagami's motion that each committee have three members and meet at least three times a year. The motion was seconded by Commission Shriver. Commissioners Tagami and Shriver voted in favor of this motion, Commissioners Cotchett, Eastwood, Hart, Kautz, Scherman, and Witt voted against. The motion did not pass.

A brief follow-up discussion concerning the open (public) nature of committee meetings took place amongst the commissioners and Chief Counsel La Franchi. Commissioner Shriver clarified that he was in favor of having three members on each committee.

Chair Hart stated that there had been a proposal by Commissioners Cotchett and Eastwood that the Chair evaluate the proposed committees, talk with the commissioners to determine where they would like to serve, develop descriptions of the committees and make appointments. Chair Hart made a motion stating this. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Eastwood. The Commissioner voted unanimously to have the Chair describe the committees, assess the commissioners interest in serving on committees, and make appointments to them.

Chair Hart asked if there could be some discussion on selecting a member to serve as liaison to the California State Parks Foundation. She asked if anyone would like to volunteer for this position. Commissioner Cotchett suggested that Chair Hart handle this appointment in the same manner as the committees.

Chair Hart volunteered to serve as the Commission's representative to the Outdoor Recreation Policy Oversight Committee. Commissioner Kautz volunteered to serve with Chair Hart on this committee. Chair Hart clarified that she and Commissioner Kautz would serve as co-members of this committee, thereby making at least one person available to attend meetings.

### **Consideration and action on the Department's recommendation for approval of the Preliminary General Plan and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for Tomales Bay State Park**

Chair Hart introduced this agenda item by explaining that in addition to the materials received prior to the meeting, the Commission would hear a presentation on the Tomales Bay State Park General Plan by General Plan Project Manager Bob Hare.

Mr. Hare presented a slide show on the 52-year history of Tomales Bay State Park, the park's resource values, including important recreational resources, its importance to the local economy, and the five planning areas for which proposals were developed in the general plan.

Chair Hart thanked Mr. Hare for the presentation and called for a break at 11:37 a.m. Chair Hart reconvened the meeting at 11:49 a.m.

Chair Hart asked if the commissioners had any questions or comments on the presentation. Chair Hart then noted that she had recently visited Tomales Bay State Park to observe the sites for which proposed changes had been made in the general plan. Chair Hart also noted that she had participated in the environmental learning program at Tomales Bay State Park, and she praised State Park Ranger Carlos Porrata, who had recently announced his plans to retire after about 35 years with State Parks.

Chair Hart noted that she disagreed with two of the proposals in the Tomales Bay State Park General Plan. She stated that she believed the many mosquitos, marshy nature, and difficult vehicular access to the park's Dream Farm area would make it a difficult and costly area to develop for visitor access,

and that the best use of this parcel would probably be as a staff housing area. Chair Hart also mentioned the Heart's Desire beach area, saying that car camping there should be limited and that this was not an appropriate place for RVs or generator use.

Chair Hart then announced that she would be calling the public speakers in the order that they had registered, and she called the first speaker:

**Gordon Bennett/Sierra Club/Environmental Action Committee of West Marin/Tomales Bay Association** – Thank you, Commissioners. I want to start off with one sentence on a prior agenda item. I'm a prior property owner in the Oakland Hills, where there was a big fire. It started in eucalyptus. I'm a current property owner in your beach, adjacent to Mt. Tam State Park, where there was a recent fire started in eucalyptus. So I am very happy when I see State Parks controlling this eucalyptus. But that's not why I'm here today. I'm here representing several different organizations, about the Tomales Bay State Park. One of those organizations is the Environmental Action Committee of West Marin: 1,000 members. The Salmon Protection and Watershed Network: 500 members. Sierra Club Marin Group: 7,000 members. Tomales Bay Association: 500 members. The Marin Conservation League: 1,000 members. The Inverness Association: 400 members. So, in Commissioner Cotchett's words, I represent 10,400 of those "stupid local people."

Chair Hart interrupted Mr. Bennett to note that Commissioner Cotchett was being facetious when he made reference to "stupid local people," and she asked if Mr. Bennett understood this.

**Gordon Bennett** – I do.

Commissioner Cotchett commented that he appreciated Mr. Bennett's facetious remark.

**Gordon Bennett** – I'm being facetious. I want to speak to the issue of the drive-in campground. I'm not reassured that this is going to be just a place for people to bring their cars and put tents in. If that were the case, that would be great. And I'm very concerned that it's going to end up to be an RV site. In this immediate area, there's 1,265 RV sites within a 12 mile radius. We have plenty of those. What we don't have is peace and quiet in this area. We don't have a lot of peace and quiet in this world. So this is a good site for that. And if we could limit the proposal for what is now a drive-in campground to the walk-in campground where people could perhaps drive their cars near it, unload their tents, but the cars would go some other place, then there would be no generators. That would be very, very good in my opinion. So that's my testimony, thank you very much.

**Michael Mery, Individual** – Thank you very much. The visitor load, according to the National Park Service, to the area has been flat for roughly 10 years. So, increasing demand for camping over what it was six years ago, I don't think the need is present. I would agree with everything the preceding speaker said with regard to the proposed camping changes. For instance, at Heart's Desire, having a walk-in campground extend the existing walk-in campgrounds. I think there are a whole variety of options. This position is also supported by State Parks staff in the Northern District, including Carlos. With respect to the Dream Farm site, as Commissioner Hart points out, much of that site is either, let's see, a seasonal or perennial wetland. Putting in any sort of a road to that site, because the current road is indeed the one lane, would involve tearing out alders and filling in the toe of a small wetland area. I would completely concur with the Commissioner's comments in that regard. Thank you very much.

Chair Hart expressed the Commission's appreciation for comments that are brief and to the point.

**Tom Baty, Individual** – Thank you, Commissioners. My name is Tom Baty, and I'm here today just representing myself as a member of the public. I have been enjoying Heart's Desire Beach for the last 47 years, so I would also like to address the proposal to allow vehicular camping in the Heart's Desire area. And the draft General Plan eloquently describes the spirit of place and the profound natural aesthetic values of the Heart's Desire area, and then proposes a significant development that is fundamentally antithetical to those values. Examination of the impacts of the proposed park camp-

ing facilities is deficient in a number of ways, many of which begin with the mis-characterization of the potential density and type of use that this facility could entail. By the park's current code, 15 campsites could actually mean 30 vehicles and 120 people permitted at this facility. Car camping physically allows campers to bring along portable generators to power TVs, radios, video games, microwaves, etcetera. At the Public Information Meeting on February 24th, we heard conflicting information from the Project Manager, that the Planning Team did not envision this facility as one that would include generators. And then we heard from the District Chief Ranger that generators are permitted in car camping facilities in state campgrounds. And if this policy is statewide, we would not be subject to a variance. A car camping facility means generators at Heart's Desire. And the Planning document does not adequately address the obvious noise impacts on both wildlife and aesthetic values. The Planning Team acknowledges this aspect was simply not considered in their planning. I am dismayed by the Planning Team's apparent intent to introduce car camping to Heart's Desire, regardless of a clear, strong public voice, that this area of Tomales Bay State Park be maintained as a quiet refuge. Heart's Desire, in its current state, seems the model of heavily-used and immensely enjoyed State Park facility that nonetheless maintains its values as a sanctuary for both the natural and human elements. I urge the Commission to reconsider a plan that would so profoundly alter the character of an existing park facility that by all measures is such a jewel. Thank you.

**Scott Kivel, Individual** – Good afternoon. I have a one-page statement I would like to read on behalf of my wife and I, but I would like to make two preparatory comments. First of all, my wife and I are both fourth generation Californians. We live across the street from the Marconi Cove area, and we take our grandchildren down there every weekend, and we're growing 1,200 olive trees across the street, and have just been certified by Marin County as organic. So we know the area quite well. And the reason I would like to focus your attention on Marconi Cove is because our view of Marconi Cove is completely different than the Staff Report. And I would also like to remind you, as you listen to our one page of comments, that we are not saying that there should be no development at Marconi Cove and it should be kept in a pristine condition. Our comments are simply directed to the scope of development which we think totally unrealistic, given the property. As residents, we would like to submit the following comments regarding the above. We are delighted that the state has purchased this property so that it can be used by the public. We are intimately familiar with it, and we wish to emphasize that it is a small sliver of waterfront property. Therefore, when we read the proposed plan, they seem far out of scale with the size of the parcel and various conditions. The plan, if not significantly down-sized, seems unguided at best. Every winter, some 90% is covered with water. Part of the land appears to be turning into an island. This sensitive habitat also has a creek flowing through it, for which a permanent bridge would need to be built, and the stability of the landfill evaluated. Although a small parking lot with an interpretive kiosk, and perhaps a place for kayakers to put in, would be appropriate to allow the public to observe the harbor seals and the bird life which are present, we are concerned about those uses when combined with the other plans. It is hard to imagine that a small site could also accommodate a larger parking lot for boats and trailers, campsites, and housing for a campground host. There are also several other factors to consider: safety, septic capacity, and water source. Number one, there is a probable inability to find potable water and adequate septic fields on this parcel. Two, going north on Highway 1, the access to the property is just downhill from a blind, dangerous curve, and going south on Highway 1, the view of oncoming traffic is restricted. It is difficult enough to access Highway 1 in a car, having boat trailers moving in and out of Marconi Cove would present a dangerous condition to which CalTrans and other experts would need to evaluate. In fact, just last year, a CalTrans dump truck crashed on that very downhill curve. Thank you.

**Caroline Dutton, Individual** – Hello, my name is Caroline Dutton. I'm a homeowner on the shores of Tomales Bay, the property that is immediately adjacent and to the north of the Marconi Cove proposed site. And there is one question I have, because I know that the property right next to mine was

being bought by the state also, as well as the Marconi Cove, and I don't know if it has been bought yet. I can't remember. That was in the plan, but there wasn't enough money. The thing that I wanted to comment on is that my family has been there on Tomales Bay since the '60s, and there has always been a problem with the fact that we're the property right adjacent to vacant property, which is now owned by the state, because that property has been used as a boat ramp for many years. I actually go away, and I'm not there on major weekends because there's 50 cars parked there, and there's no bathroom facilities, so everybody comes around and uses our property for that, and there's radios, and this happens all the time, and it's also like a road turnout. So that people stop in the middle of the night, and when my daughter was young I was worried for her safety. People would also stop in the middle of the night and sleep there. Or sleep there for several days. So, this all shows that public access is really needed. But as the presenter said, the public needs to be educated and regulated. There really does need to be a boat ramp, for people to have boat access that's much more regulated with the facilities. It may not need to be there, but my request is that, for one thing, there be a buffer zone between the residents, because I'm the first of the houses on the bay to the north, and the property next door needs to be in the buffer zone, and not the place where the parking lot is and the boat ramp is, but the actual Old Marconi Cove, and that the quantity be regulated. And that there be some kind of host there to make sure that there isn't loud music at night. It's going to be for bicyclists, and I've done a lot of bicycling myself, and I've gone to state parks where bicyclists are always welcome, of course, because there is no other way to get anywhere else. And that also at the same time motorcyclists are just as welcome to come in the middle of the night. When you're a bicyclist, you need a place to sleep. You're really tired, and you don't want to have people drinking beer around you and being noisy and, and it's really very different, you know to...

Chair Hart clarified that the campgrounds proposed at Marconi Cove are walk-in, not drive-in. Chair Hart assured Ms. Dutton that motorcycles would not be permitted.

**Caroline Dutton** – I think it's wonderful because I think the public access is so needed. And I think it's wonderful the state is going to be in charge of this and that it can be provided in a way that's not going to be difficult for the residents. I just hope that the facilities end up, because you were saying the bathroom facilities were going to be on the north end, which is where the houses are, so it would be great if there was a buffer zone there, and the times that the noise level is regulated.

**Donna Sheehan, Individual** – Donna Sheehan, a 35-year resident of Marshall, and one of the original residents of Millerton Point. That goes back into the '50s, '60s, and '70s when the state burned my house. But, having said that, I want to congratulate all of you for your volunteerism and this very esteemed panel we have here. I just read all of your bios, it's amazing. Thank you for being here for us. I second what Caroline just said. I second Scott Kivel, as I just said. As a resident of Marshall, at Marconi there is a need for launching, and the basically illegal launching that has been taking place between the private property between Caroline's house, as well, and Marconi, has been an irritant to local residents. And for example, on weekdays we have one to five cars. Spring, other than winter we have 20 to 25 cars. On holidays, anywhere from 25 to 40, sometimes 50 cars. Now, I don't know how you're going to shift this public interest in this commandeered launch, but of course it's needed. We all know that. The noise factor has been extreme. The basic public in your face is scary. And one other thing, if the state does manage this property, a host, I think, would be required, as well as, I don't know, this hasn't been mentioned, but the previous owners created these huge tire barriers like a pier. What do you call it? Brick. And those have broken loose, and they're around that point as well as going down the bay. So those tires need to be removed. One other thing, Millerton Point. Having observed the traffic at Millerton, as well as the usage of the county park just north of Point Reyes, I can see no reason for enlarging the parking lot or the restroom facilities at Millerton Point, at least at this stage. I would put that last on your priority for funding. And, let's see, one other thing. RVs, we still have the same feeling about RVs. I mean, Highway 1 is not an RV highway. It's the cause of major, major, traffic problems. These huge RVs, and there are no pullouts for these big ve-

hicles. But thank you for being here, and thank you for listening.

Chair Hart thanked the speakers and asked if there were any other registered or unregistered speakers on this topic. There being no other speakers, Chair Hart asked if there was any other information not previously provided to the Commission that staff wished to present in response to the public comments received. Chair Hart then closed the public comment on this topic, and indicated the comments would be discussed by the Commission.

Commissioner Eastwood requested that Chair Hart have State Parks staff respond to the public comments before the Commission began their discussion.

Chair Hart introduced North Bay District Superintendent Joe Mette who had conducted her tour of Tomales Bay State Park, and asked if he would respond to the public comments received. Superintendent Mette replied that Project Manager Bob Hare should respond.

Chair Hart clarified that she was particularly interested in staff's response to the comments on the Marconi Cove development and car camping in the Heart's Desire area.

Tomales Bay State Park Project Manager Bob Hare explained that in the Marconi Cove area the high tide does not come up to a point where it covers the site, and that with a proper design, the site could be made usable with proper drainage. Mr. Hare stated that the riparian area to the south of Marconi Cove was treated with great sensitivity in the general plan. Mr. Hare also explained that trailer and RV use was not necessarily planned for this area, but that it was one of many proposals available from a menu of options. He stated that a CalTrans study would be conducted before a proposal to allow RVs would be considered. Mr. Hare noted that the plan was meant to offer a menu of options, and that incorporating all of the options would be too much for the available space.

Regarding the idea of a buffer zone between the residents and the Marconi Cove area, Mr. Hare pointed out that State Parks did not own or control the beach property that was mentioned for use as a buffer in the public comments. He clarified that State Parks was aware that boat launching took place there, and that there were also people living on boats moored off shore that leave cars parked there. He explained that this area was not under State Parks' control. He emphasized that if this property could be purchased in the future it could be used to create a buffer zone, and State Parks would work with the local residents on proposals for this area.

Regarding car camping in the Heart's Desire area, Mr. Hare stated that the general plan was designed to provide a road map for the park's next 20 years. In doing this the general plan attempts to anticipate future needs, but it is not possible to anticipate all possible needs. He stated that once development was to begin comprehensive studies would be conducted which would involve the neighboring community. He stated that the actual proposal might be for only walk-in camping, or no camping at all. Mr. Hare distributed to the commissioners some alternative language for the general plan that altered "drive-in" camping to "walk-in" camping.

Commissioner Shriver asked if references to car camping could be removed from the general plan in consideration of the local residents' concerns. A discussion took place amongst Mr. Hare, Chair Hart, Commissioner Scherman, and Commissioner Shriver, during which Mr. Hare explained that the general plan was meant to provide possibilities and allow for the potential funding of development projects. The commissioners agreed that they understood this, but that it was their preference that the references to car camping be removed from this part of the general plan with the understanding that if this type of development was going to be seriously considered in the future it could be addressed in a general plan amendment.

Chair Hart asked if there were any other questions from the commissioners.

Commissioner Eastwood asked about the possibility of a land exchange in the North Marshall area of the park that had been mentioned by Mr. Hare.

Mr. Hare explained that while the North Marshall property possessed valuable natural resources, recreational access to this area was difficult. This, in conjunction with the property's remote location from the rest of Tomales Bay State Park, caused the general plan team to propose that State Parks conduct discussions with the National Parks Service, or the Audubon Society (who owns land adjacent to this property) about a management arrangement to reduce state costs while gaining other benefits. Commissioner Eastwood expressed concern that properties could be purchased without consideration for their long-term usefulness. Mr. Hare explained that it was his understanding that this property had been purchased 25 years ago at the encouragement of the local community to save it from development.

Commissioner Tagami stated that he had three questions. He asked whether or not a cost analysis was conducted before proposing activities in a general plan, and if so, how this impacts future budgeting. He asked if the concerns and complaints presented in today's public comments were reflected in the number of citations issued in and around the area by law enforcement. He also asked if there was an anticipated date by which all of the general plan proposals would be implemented.

Mr. Hare explained that general plans are developed over a two- to three-year period, and that the project budgets don't allow for the field trips or in-depth analysis that the specialists involved would like to conduct. Many details are therefore left to the second-tier California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process. The general plans focus on what is appropriate and feasible at a particular park rather than how much a particular proposal might cost.

Commissioner Tagami asked if it was possible to estimate the costs associated with delivering the activities proposed in the general plan to the public.

North Bay Area District Superintendent Joe Mette responded to this question. Superintendent Mette stated that estimates of development costs are not made at the time a general plan is created. He explained that needs are first identified before a decision is made to implement a proposal, and that once a decision had been made a capital improvement process is conducted. This includes a feasibility study based on the general plan, environmental review and permitting, the design phase, and then construction. It's in the design phase where actual construction estimates can be made. He further explained that the Department of Finance reviewed this process at every phase.

Commissioner Tagami stated that the balance of his questions could be addressed at another time, but that he'd like to hear about the law enforcement aspects of the concerns raised by the speakers, illegal overnight camping, noise, public drinking, etc.

Superintendent Mette asked Supervising State Park Ranger Dave Matthews to answer this question.

Ranger Matthews stated that the number of law enforcement incidents at Tomales Bay State Park were very small, the majority of complaints being related to dogs off-leash. Ranger Matthews stated that regarding the interactions reported by neighbors in the Marconi Cove area, this would potentially need to be addressed with additional staffing if the area is developed.

Commissioner Tagami stated that it was always possible to spend more time on a document, to refine it further. He noted that given this is a general plan, his preference would be to move forward in adopting this plan, realizing that it can be refined when a specific project is proposed.

Project Manager Bob Hare noted that each written comment received during the general plan process is responded to in writing, and that those comments and responses were contained within the general plan document. He also noted that the comments received during today's meeting were not new, and that they had already been responded to in writing. Mr. Hare again stated that alternative language had already been developed to address the concerns about drive-in camping.

Commissioner Cotchett stated that he was delighted to hear commissioners asking about the costs associated with the proposals of a general plan. He also mentioned that he was very familiar with the

Marconi Cove area and the safety concerns related to Highway 1 and vehicle access there. Commissioner Cotchett further stated his concern over the finite resources that were currently available, and that he believed the commissioners needed to hear more detail about what general plan proposals would cost.

Commissioner Shriver asked about the revised language related to drive-in camping in the Heart's Desire area. Chair Hart asked Commissioner Shriver to present the revisions. Commissioner Shriver and Chief Counsel Tim La Franchi then discussed procedure related to adopting the Tomales Bay State Park General Plan to include the revised language.

Commissioner Shriver described the proposed revisions for the benefit of all present. He explained that these revisions are to be made to Guideline HD-8 of the general plan. In the revision below strike-out indicates deleted text and underline indicates added text:

### **Develop Small ~~Drive-in~~ Campground above the Entrance Station**

The current park maintenance storage area (the "boneyard" ~~site~~) ~~is a suitable location~~ may be considered for development of an approximately 15-site (maximum) ~~drive-in~~ campground for small vehicles. The campground could include some "walk-in" sites, a campground host site, and a small campfire center. The design and operation of this campground is intended for tent camping, with low impact uses that are compatible with the aesthetic qualities of the Heart's Desire Area. This campground would help address the local deficit of this kind of public camping experience in the West Marin area.

It was established that this amendment to the Tomales Bay State Park General Plan would be available for viewing on the State Parks web site.

Chair Hart stated that she wished to make an additional amendment to the general plan. She stated that the Inverness Area proposals on page 167, related to the picnic area on the North Dream Farm property, should be deleted from the plan.

Commissioner Cotchett pointed out that references to the proposals that Chair Hart wished to delete on page 167 also appeared on pages 220 and 221 of the general plan. A discussion took place amongst Chair Hart, Commissioner Cotchett, Commissioner Shriver, and Chief Counsel Tim La Franchi concerning the commissioners' goal of changing the plan in the manner described. Mr. La Franchi stated that removal of the references on pages 220 and 221 would not be necessary as these references were an analysis of alternatives that were proposed for deletion from the general plan.

With the commissioners satisfied that the general plan had been amended in a manner that would accomplish their stated goals, Chair Hart asked for a motion to adopt a resolution approving the amended Preliminary General Plan and Environmental Impact Report for Tomales Bay State Park. Motion Commissioner Scherman, second Commissioner Kautz. The commissioners voted unanimously to adopt the resolution approving the Tomales Bay State Park General Plan and Environmental Impact Report as amended.

### **Consideration and action on the Department's recommendation for approval of the preliminary General Plan and Environmental Impact Report for Sugarloaf Ridge State Park**

Chair Hart explained that in addition to the materials the Commission received prior to the meeting, they would now hear a presentation on the Sugarloaf Ridge State Park General Plan by Diablo Vista District Superintendent Don Monahan.

District Superintendent Monahan thanked the commissioners for participating in the previous day's site briefing at Sugarloaf Ridge State Park. District Superintendent Monahan stated that the general plan represented the tremendous passion, dedication, and commitment of State Parks staff, as well as

the local community and user groups who participated in the development of the plan. District Superintendent Monahan then introduced Paul Curfman of EDAW, the primary author of the plan, and Robin Ettinger, State Parks' General Plan Project Manager, to present the plan to the Commission.

Mr. Ettinger described his role in the oversight of the general plan process and the relationship between State Parks and EDAW. Mr. Ettinger and Mr. Curfman presented a slide show that included an overview of the history and geography of Sugarloaf Ridge State Park, the initial and subsequent property acquisitions, and the park's relationship to other state, county, and regional parks in the vicinity. The presentation included a brief listing of the park's resources, the management zones proposed in the general plan, and a summary of the public processes that were an essential part of the development of the plan. In closing Mr. Ettinger listed the organizations that participated in the creation of the general plan: Sonoma County Agriculture Protection and Open Space District, Sonoma County Regional Parks, California Native Plant Society, Sonoma Ecology Center, LandPaths, the Bay Area Ridge Trail Council, Back Country Horsemen, Valley of the Moon Observatory, and the Valley of the Moon Natural History Association.

Chair Hart thanked the presenters and announced that this agenda item was now open for public comment. She asked that those addressing the Commission be as brief as possible, as several of the Commissioners would soon be running up against air flight deadlines. She called the first speaker on this agenda item:

**Dee Swanhuysen, Bay Area Ridge Trail Council** – Thank you. It is essential to the body and spirit of the human animal to connect with and retain a close relationship with our natural world. One of our responsibilities is to maintain and enhance the balance between the built and natural environments of our little planet. And, last night, the State Parks staff really exemplified how sensitive they are to that goal. Marla's presentation was fantastic, and showed her passion and expertise. And Don Monahan, our new superintendent, gave us a really good idea of how to include ourselves in the symphony of the natural world. And I just want to say that the State Park System, especially here in the Silverado, and in the new Diablo Vista District, is a vital part of the Bay Area Ridge Trails partnership. And we are creating 500 miles of trail around the Bay Area, and we do connect six State Parks, and they are Mt. Tamalpais, Samuel P. Taylor State Park, Jack London, Annadel, Sugarloaf, of course, and the Benicia State Recreation Area. And now our job is to connect those parts. We have dedicated trails in each of these parks. And we have been working with you for about 17 years. And now the job will be to connect those parks through the private property lands, and create partnerships with these property owners. We have been working very closely with a number of them around Sugarloaf Ridge State Park, and we are very hopeful and confident that these connections will be made, and there will be additional partnerships that we will have to establish with you over time to create the complete 500 mile trail. We have 265 miles dedicated right now. And, this Sugarloaf Ridge Master Plan is really a great step forward to accomplishing those relationships around Sugarloaf. I had a little more to say, but I'm going to cut it a little bit short. And I wanted to suggest that you come to the next dedication of the Ridge Trail, which will be at the Carquinez Bridge, 1.4 miles of trail, with great views of the whole Bay Area. So that's Sunday, May 16th. Our partnership there is the Bay Trail and CalTrans, and MTC. So please, come along. And lastly, I brought each of you a Ridge Trail hat, and I'm hoping that after the meeting I can get a quick photo opportunity and get you with these hats on. So I'll try my best on that. Thank you.

**Craig Anderson, LandPaths** – Thank you, Madam Chair, and Commissioners. Craig Anderson, Executive Director of Land Partners Through Stewardship, better known as LandPaths in these parts. And I just want to thank you for your work on behalf of California State Parks, especially I appreciate the attention to detail, in terms of the dizzying amount of logistics, policies, committees, and associated paperwork that helps the Parks staff do their jobs. Because really, it's our parks that are simply the best of what we have as California is to treasure and steward for future generations. For the past seven years we have worked closely with State Parks and the Open Space District here in



Sonoma County, and what we do is we help steward, develop access to, and provide educational programs, not only in our parks, but on private lands that are making the transition to future parkland. We have served as the lead agency on constructing new Bay Ridge Trail, and Jack London, as we talked about earlier, and operating the 1,100 acre McCormick addition of Sugarloaf Ridge State Park for five years, and ongoing work in Sonoma Coast State Beach. However, while we are proud of that work, it's the opportunities we have helped create for people in wheelchairs, at-risk youth around Santa Rosa and in Greater Sonoma County, and our new Californians, whose first language is not necessarily English, to enjoy and steward our parks. That is perhaps the most important contribution we can make to our community. Our work is not possible without dozens of community volunteers and the wealth that they give and receive is beyond measure. I humbly ask the Commission to encourage the development of even more relationships with non-profit and community groups, and stewarding our irreplaceable state treasures. As Commissioner Cotchett alluded to, the locals have a great knowledge base, and passion for the parks in their own backyards. They could be our park's greatest non-uniformed champions. Last, LandPaths commends State Parks staff, locally, and in Sacramento, on preparing the preliminary General Plan for Sugarloaf Ridge State Park, and thanks again for this opportunity.

**Andrea MacKenzie, Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation & Open Space District** – Good morning, Madam Chair, members of the Board. I am privileged to be the first to have the microphone put down to a lower level so I could speak (laughter). I represent the rather silent, but quietly effective partner here in Sonoma County, and some of you may have been briefed yesterday, but the Sonoma County residents are fortunate enough to have an Open Space District, funded by a 1/4% sales tax. We have been in existence for over 10 years, since 1990, and our purpose is to preserve farmland, scenic landscapes, and the natural values of this county for both people and wildlife. And we've put our sales tax measure to work in protecting over 6,000 acres to date in this county. Over 2,000 of the acres you just saw in those slides were purchased with sales tax funding, and I was doing a little calculation this morning. We're working on major additions to four of your state parks in Sonoma County, I believe it's 6,000 acres and four parks, and when we're done, hopefully in the next year, we will have spent 37 million dollars on those additions. Included in that is Sugarloaf Ridge State Park, and the piece of property you saw as Nun's Canyon, which we know as the Beltane Ranch. It's 1,300 acres of stunning piece of property. We're in the final stages of negotiations on that property, and it will be a major addition to Sugarloaf Ridge State Park if we can get it. And, lastly, I just wanted to take this opportunity before you, to ask for your assistance, and encouragement on something. We are pioneering here in Sonoma County, both by design and necessity, a new way of approaching land acquisition, management, and stewardship, using local dollars matched with state dollars, and we can help you. One of the things we're running up against is there are at least four or five pieces of property we have already bought, or are buying, that we want to turn over to State Parks, and we're going to run into a road block with the Department of Finance. We want to open a dialogue with State Parks, and state government, about how we can work collectively, and cooperatively. Not to just pull up the gate, and say no more State Parks, but how can we work together with locals to match our monies and resources, so we can keep going in the forward moving direction. So, with that, I would like to thank you so much for your time this morning, and I'm going to give Louis some handouts about our District.

Chair Hart asked how much the Open Space District had spent to date on additions to state parks.

**Andrea MacKenzie** – We have spent, trying to come at it a different way, we've spent probably about \$130 million dollars to date in Sonoma County, and about 30% of that funding at least has gone to fee purchases, with a good part of that to State Parks. So, we are right now partnering with the State Park bond money, your major acquisition arm for Sonoma County.

Commissioner Cotchett noted that the amount was approximately \$37 million. Chair Hart commented that the tremendous contribution the Sonoma County Open Space District had made to State

Park land was unprecedented in the state. Chair Hart also stated that she was thrilled to be personally involved with the Sonoma County Open Space District, and that she felt it was an honor to live in Sonoma County. She also commended Andrea MacKenzie for her phenomenal work as manager for the District.

**Andrea MacKenzie** – If I might add one final thing that you may not be aware of, the first step in these parks is getting the land. And then comes holding it, developing it, and maintaining it. And one of the things I think we’re pioneering here in Sonoma County is when you are not able to take the land immediately, we are holding on to it, and taking care of it. We are working with our partners like LandPaths to get grants and put county funds into early site development and planning. So some of the documents you may be seeing along the way are paid for not by the state, but by the sales tax here in Sonoma County and other counties. So we’re trying our best to help you be able to say yes to special places like this.

Chair Hart stated that Andrea MacKenzie had not mentioned an important acquisition currently underway on the Sonoma County coast. The Sonoma County Open Space District recently received approval for, in addition to a \$10 million contribution towards the \$20 million acquisition price, \$300,000 that will go directly to State Parks to help them develop this property and open it to the public. Chair Hart stated that this was a great program.

Commissioner Eastwood asked how much the state contributes to matching grants for acquisitions.

**Andrea MacKenzie** – It totally varies. For instance, the Nun’s Canyon piece there is 1,300 acres; it’s a \$9.1 million dollar deal, and we will pay 100% of that.

Chair Hart noted that the Open Space District typically paid 100% of acquisition costs.

**Andrea MacKenzie** – That’s more typical. Yesterday at the Wildlife Conservation Board, on a 3,500-acre acquisition out at Sonoma Coast, it’s a \$21 million dollar deal, and the District will pay \$10.5 million.

Commissioner Eastwood stated that Sonoma County should be commended for putting their money where their mouth is. A brief discussion took place amongst Commissioner Cotchett, Commissioner Eastwood, Chair Hart, Commissioner Kautz, and Andrea MacKenzie about how Sonoma County Open Space District transactions are negotiated, and the efforts the District makes to obtain donations of land and make transactions attractive for sellers.

Commissioner Cotchett noted that Sonoma County was not only admirable for its financial support of parks, but that its citizens also contributed much more than just a sales tax contribution. He stated that on the previous day’s site visit the commissioners walked across a bridge in the park that had been entirely constructed by volunteers. Commissioner Cotchett stated that he and the commissioners were overwhelmed by the level of volunteer commitment that takes place in Sonoma County.

**Ken Wells, Sonoma County Trails Council** – Good afternoon. My name is Ken Wells. I am the President of the Sonoma County Trails Council, and I don’t think I’ve had a better segue before about your volunteerism. I’ve lived here going on almost 14 years now, and the passion, and the belief of the community is unsurpassed in any place I’ve lived in California, and I’ve lived all my life in California. I will try to be brief, I know everybody is, I was thinking I was going to be gone hours ago. I do represent an organization that has been in Sonoma County since 1967. We represent the non-motorized trail users, bicycles, equestrians, and hikers. We are the oldest multi-use advocacy organization in the nation. It was born here in Sonoma County because we believe in the trails, and the need for them, and the fact that it is an important part of our life. And the trails council has been doing this stuff for nearly 40 years. We have been helping advocate for trails. We have been helping build trails. We have been helping maintain trails. And that all through volunteer effort, because we believe in it. And I want to give credit to the State Parks staff. I don’t want to slight any other state

department, but I've never met state department staff from any other department that believe in what they are doing. They're there because they want to be there, and not because it's a paycheck. And I want to give credit to them for that. And I think I see the nods, yes, you all appreciate that, you do. And I want to give a credit to them. The Trails Council didn't really comment too much on this General Plan for Sugarloaf Ridge State Park because we thought it was great from the beginning. We're trails, obviously, we're not so interested in the campgrounds that are serving some of these other parts of the community, but the trails opportunities in Sugarloaf along the Mayacamas Ridge are tremendous. And this is a significant, major step forward in that effort, and we really appreciate that. So we want to say we support the proposed plan, and in fact, I think the thing I want to leave you all with is that it's a good balance. It does do a wonderful job of protecting the resources there, but it also gives us an ability to be stewards to enjoy it. To be out there. And that's really where I come from, the ability to enjoy that resource, to recognize that it's there. So we have that stewardship, that belief, and that is important to us. And I think that's what this project will let you do. And finally, we look forward, as a Trails Council, as volunteers in Sonoma County, to working closely with the District Superintendent in implementation of this plan. I have a statistic that I've been sharing with people since I've lived here. Forty percent of Marin County, the county immediately to the south of us, is publicly owned. They have hundreds of miles of trails. In Sonoma County four percent of the land is publicly owned. We have a dearth. We have a very tremendous shortage of trail opportunities. And this is going to make a huge impact on that. So we look forward to working with staff in developing a shared trail use system in this area, to link up with a broader regional trails system. And thank you very much for supporting this, and I hope to see your approval of it in a very short time here. Thank you very much.

**Steve Perry, Individual** – Hi, I'm Steve Perry of Glen Ellen. I want to thank the Parks folks for having the tour yesterday, and you folks for attending. I think that was good for all of us. I was happy to hear earlier that you had all read the general plans, hopefully you've also read the comments and responses to comments, because often that's where citizens like me get more than our three minutes. I hope you can really do that. My letter was letter eleven, essentially focused on traffic issues, and I want to just hit a couple of points, and not dredge through the whole piece. The response to comments essentially said that the traffic study and the EIR from a traffic standpoint was associated with and approved by actions of Sonoma County, and I think you heard that a little bit today in the presentation. Now the Crane Transportation Study was in fact commissioned by the County, for the Sonoma Country Inn EIR, however, none of the decision-making portion of the County Government has passed on either the Traffic Study or the EIR at this point. In fact, its next earliest opportunity is May 20th. One other point from the traffic standpoint is, the Traffic Study for the General Plan focused heavily on the park's busiest time, which is Sunday afternoon. However, they didn't really deal with the issue that may or may not be, and I think they said, was not Highway 12's busiest time, or busiest quarter through the valley, its busiest time is on a Friday. Now, just because it doesn't coincide with the park's busiest time doesn't mean that additions onto that will not keep it from going over an unbearable level. So I think that we need to look at that a little bit more. The last point is on the Nun's Canyon access to the Beltane Ranch. The Beltane Quarry area is a wonderful area, and it's great to have, however, Nun's Canyon, and associated Milligan Road is an absolute charm in and of itself. It's barely paved, and just a few years past stagecoach days. Is there really a reason why we need to develop it into the modern era? That can be a heritage road for the County of Sonoma. Thank you, and I appreciate your time and efforts, and good thought towards this.

**Elizabeth Hugill, Sonoma County Horse Council** – Hello. I'm here on behalf of the Sonoma County Horse Council. The Council is a member of the California Equestrian Trails and Land Coalition. On behalf of the residents of this state, I wish to commend the morally motivated members of the Commission, and thank them for their time and dedication to all of recreation and parks issues. One of the primary goals of the Council is the continued enhancement and improvement of equestrian access to trails in and facilities at recreational areas. In Sonoma County the equine community

contributes \$185 million each year as the value added back to the economy in this county. The Sonoma State University economic survey, which will be published any day now, will probably increase that amount considerably. I would like to invite this Commission to join our struggle. The equine community has often been ill-treated, overlooked, and without voice in the legislative and recreational decision making processes at state level. The equestrian community through the Council is willing and available for the Commission, as not only an educational resource, for the wishes and dreams and needs of the courses in recreational areas, but also as an energetic source of volunteers for any and all assistance. And we don't ask prevailing wage either, so, thank you very much.

**Philip Sales, Sonoma County Regional Parks Department** – Madam Chairman, Members of the Commission, Phillip Sales, Park Planning and Administrator for the Regional Parks Department. Just a couple of things. First of all, I would like to commend the State Parks Department for presenting this plan today and preparing it. 10 years ago I was out on the property with Bud Getty, former Park Superintendent, and he was bemoaning the lack of a plan for Sugarloaf and today is the day, hopefully, it will get adopted. One of the things that I wanted to point out on the slides that were shown earlier was the acquisition of the county's property, the Johnson Ranch, which is off Highway 12. This is the piece of property that was the last purple piece that sort of flew in on the slide show. This is a really critical piece to us because it's actually going to change the dynamics of how we use Hood Mountain Regional Park, which, of course, connects to Sugarloaf. This particular property was acquired by the Open Space District last year. We are in the process of completing our detailed master plan on that. We anticipate that most of the visitors to Hood Mountain in the future will come off Highway 12 and Pythian Road, because the Los Alamos Road access which you saw, which is on the right north end of the combination of facilities, is a long road at six miles. It's very windy, and it's not very well paved, and as the environmental document states, several substantial improvements would have to be made to it over time. So we anticipate that most of our use is going to come actually from the Pythian Road access point. But this brings into focus the issue that Bud Getty, the former superintendent and I talked about 10 years ago. We need to buy those intervening properties between Sugarloaf and Hood Mountain, to make this plan a reality. Because the connectivity right now is not very desirable, the connection on the Good Speed Trail and the connection between McCormick are not very adequate, and we really do need to acquire some of those intervening properties. And I hope that State Parks, and ourselves with the Open Space District and the Bay Area Ridge Trail can make that a priority to make that happen. Thank you so much.

**Brenda Landau, Individual** – Hi, my name is Brenda Landau, and I'm coming as a community member and also founder of an organization, we're starting it now. Basically, we are dog owners, and we are outdoors people who like to hike. We love to hike. I mean, I grew up since I was this big, hiking in the outdoors, and one of the reasons we moved up to Sonoma County was we looked around and it was beautiful. And we thought, this is great. We came up here, brought our daughter, our dog of 13 years died, we got another one, and all of a sudden, come to discover, that most, and I thank the Regional Parks for most of their access, most are not opened to dog access. And, as someone who lives in Sonoma County, pays taxes, owns a home, pays state taxes, we are here talking about meeting the needs of the various constituencies all the way from our Hispanic immigrants that want grills so that they can have picnics, to the equestrians, to the mountain bikers, and, you've got people like me who spend a lot of time training my dogs. By the time we're done, I have a well-trained dog. I guess it's the goal of most people, if you're going to have a dog, be responsible, take care of it, and train it. And then, when you want to go somewhere, you don't have the access. Now, there are just a few things I want to point out, from my perspective having backpacked with my dog for years. I'm a 100 pound woman, all right. I don't carry a lot of weight. So my dog is my pack dog. Fortunately, like this summer, my husband, my daughter, and I, we're leaving the county. We're going over to Inyo National Forest in the eastern sierras, so we can backpack as a family, which includes the dog. If I want to go camping with my daughter, who is four years old, and when I do it by myself, there is a deterrent value as a woman for having a dog. I mean he may lick you to death, but

you don't know that. I know that. But if I'm sleeping in a campsite, like I spent nine months in the back of my pickup truck, hit the western states, all the way down, from Mexico to Mt. Robbins, and I'd sleep in my truck or I'd backpack. And if someone came up, I remember the next day I met this very nice young man who said "You've got a great dog." He was leashed, I was right there. He said, "Yeah, I came, within about 10 feet, I was walking, and all I heard is a little growl," and he said, "I backed up." The next morning I met him, we said "hi." And as a woman, and especially near urban interfaces, I feel better being able to walk with my companion, because he's a companion, and he's trained as a pack dog. When my daughter was one or two, I'd throw her in a backpack, she's 25 pounds, all right. But for those of you who have children, when you need to carry water and snacks, and flashlights, and extra clothes, I couldn't carry 45 pounds. But if I take my dog, throw the stuff on him, throw my kid, I have access. And so, my desire for quality outdoor experience includes my well-trained pet. It's something that is really important. Like I hear, it's amazing all the trails, we talk about the 500 trails, the walk-in camping, and I just want you, as a Commission, to think about, that we're a constituency also. Everyone has concerns, whether its bikers or horses, and I guess we'd like to be part of the dialogue. We'd like to be part of the discussion with you, to meet the needs of everyone, so I can go hiking and camping by myself, with my kids. Thank you.

Chair Hart was about to close the public comment on this agenda item when she was addressed by an unregistered speaker, Katherine Sherett (may not be correct spelling):

**Katherine Sherett, Individual** – I'm Katherine Sherett. I live on Nun's Canyon Road. I hate to be the fly in the ointment when everybody is so thrilled about this State Parks acquisition of land, but I think there are some serious flaws with the basic plan of the trail along Nun's Canyon Road. One of those being that that is the only access road for many residents in that area. And the State Parks has not been able to show any plan for deviating the equestrian and hiking public off of the access road for people that need to utilize that road to get home. I'd like to state that I think the General Plan is way too vague to truly assess any environmental impacts to the environment, and I'm skeptical that the state would actually put this much money into the general plan and then abandon this plan if they do find that there will be environmental risks. I have many other comments, but I'd just like to keep it short for you. The proposed trail along Nun's Canyon Road is about 70 feet from my front door. This has led to concern about security risks. People have hiked that trail with dogs that have come across the creek and been aggressive towards my children. People have ridden their horses across the creek, through my garden, to re-enter Nun's Canyon Road. And a couple of months ago, I had to call the Sonoma County Sheriff, because one hiker was pestering my 11-year-old daughter, trying to find out where she lived. You may have seen my house if you hiked the trail on Nun's Canyon Road, it's the green house right across the creek. And the state hasn't been able to give me any assurances of any kind of security fences, or whether or not they would be willing to redirect the trail away from our home for security and privacy reasons. Those are just a few.. I have written several letters. I hope all the comments from the residents of the area will be looked at. There are some major concerns, and I appreciate your time.

Chair Hart addressed Ms. Sherett, stating that the property in question had not yet been acquired by State Parks, and that if this property is acquired, State Parks will conduct public meetings to determine what types of access are appropriate, and discuss issues like the ones raised by Ms. Sherett.

Chair Hart then closed the public comment on this agenda item, and asked if the commissioners wished to have any discussion on the Sugarloaf Ridge State Park General Plan.

Commissioner Tagami stated that he wished to formally thank Ms. Marla Hastings and the other State Parks staff members that conducted the Commission's site visit on the previous day. Commissioner Tagami expressed his satisfaction with a discussion he had had with staff, and he mentioned that these staff members had demonstrated great ingenuity in funding the various improvements that are contemplated in the general plan. Commissioner Tagami asked that Director Coleman take note

of these staff members and their ideas, and work to spread these resources throughout State Parks.

Chair Hart asked if Commissioner Tagami was making a motion to approve the resolution adopting the Preliminary General Plan and Environmental Impact Report for Sugarloaf Ridge State Park. Motion Commissioner Tagami, second Commissioner Shriver. The commissioners voted unanimously to approve the resolution adopting the Preliminary General Plan and Environmental Impact Report for Sugarloaf Ridge State Park.

#### **OPEN PUBLIC COMMENT** (on subjects other than those listed on the agenda)

Chair Hart announced that there were several speakers registered for the Open Public Comment portion of the meeting. Chair Hart stated that she had reviewed the submitted speaker registration forms and noted that all of the speakers appeared to be commenting on Morro Bay State Park. Chair Hart asked that these speakers please keep their comments to three minutes as the meeting had run much longer than anticipated and some of the commissioners were now very close to missing their plane flights (Commissioners Shriver and Tagami excused themselves from the meeting at this point). She also asked that speakers please consider whether or not they might be saying the same thing as another who had spoken before. She then called the first registered speaker for Open Public Comment:

**Betty Winholtz, Individual** – I'm Betty Winholtz, city council member from the City of Morro Bay. We are here today because we believe you are sincere about your mission to protect and hold in trust the state resources. We believe you will question the activities and operations that we will bring to your attention. We believe that you have the influence through your mandated oversight and advisory role to change these ongoing activities so that our natural, cultural, and historic resources will be protected. Unfortunately, this particular park unit, has, in the last year, violated the Endangered Species Act, violated the California Natural Resources Code, CEQA, county agreements, and city ordinances. The DPR staff claim that the public has had ample opportunity for input. They do not understand why we are Johnny-Come-Lately complainers. I suggest it is because the EIR was submitted without a specific plan. In addition, the subsequent plan that came forward varied and is inconsistent with the general plan. Once it was known and understood by the public, there was an outcry. Both before and after the City Council unanimously denied the DPR permit, attempts were made to dialogue with local DPR representatives to seek solutions to controversial parts of the renovation. As this failed, concerns were sent to state DPR representatives. At the California Coastal Commission revocation hearing three of seven Commissioners believed that they had been intentionally misled. Most recently, we have shared our concerns with the Natural Resources Commission. What we say today is backed by visual and written documentation. You need not take our word for it. In fact, we are here today to ask you to investigate for yourselves. And what you do, we encourage you, and when you do, we encourage you to speak confidentially with the rank and file park employees, as well as the docents. We have informed ourselves regarding the state policy. What we see and have evidence of does not match the regulations and requirements that we read. What we bring to you today are not isolated incidences, and accidents, but a pattern of seemingly intentional neglect and unwarranted damage that we find unacceptable. Despite media claims by DPR representatives that they are working with the community, in fact, they are not. The City of Morro Bay, more than once, has had to resort to the Public Records Act, to obtain copies of DPR documents. In addition, DPR did not honor the legal time line for supplying the requested documentation. Even to this day, we have not received all that we have asked for. Literally hundreds of California residents and visitors have sent emails, letters, and spoken at public meetings opposing aspects of the campground renovations. Our goals remain the same. To keep the monarch habitat from being compromised, to protect raptor habitat for their continuing presence, and to honor the work of the World War I veterans and other CCC enrollees who built the campground, by preserving the fruits of their labor. We continue to support ADA compliance, but are suspicious when it is used as an excuse for altering the special character of this campground. Please, exercise the duties of your office.

**Kenneth Switras, Individual** – My name is Kenneth Switras, and I speak today as an architectural and art historian. When I speak about Morro Bay State Park I find myself in an unusual situation, as I represent both 7th generation visionaries such as Frederick Law Olmsted, Andrew Keith Hill, Duncan McDuffie, in their dreams of publicly-owned parks. And I also represent, and I am here to protect, the dreams of our 7th generation, those who are yet to be born. Morro Bay State Park is one of the first 20 State Parks to be founded after the establishment of the new State Parks System in 1928. The site was acquired in 1934. From 1934 to 1957, the majority of the present campground areas were developed into their present use, configuration and landscaping. The work currently underway threatens both the 1934 to 1939 CCC, WPA park rustic sections and the 1946 and 1957 mid-century beaches and park sections. Will turn much of the conflicting natural, historic, and cultural assets to those areas that are inside the historic district into non-contributing resources at DPR, if the DPR continues the planned destruction and modification of contributing historic fabric. The historic fabric includes everything within the site, the road beds, the individual campsites, vegetation including all trees, all furniture, and all rock work. In the work already done, what has the DPR done in cataloging and recording and keeping records of the materials that they are removing. Historic preservation of both the park rustic and mid-century standard design features in the campground depend on the recognition by the DPR that the Morro Bay State Campground is indeed a historic district and is eligible for historic registration. Specifically, classified as a designed landscape, it is a landscape that was consciously designed and laid out by the landscape architects and engineers of the CCC to completely design Morro Bay State Park. And it was felt by the CCC enrollees and work crews of the DPA and WPA. In the mid-century section we found continuity in development and features that were designed to maintain consistency in philosophy of landscaping features from the pre-World War II park rustic sections to the post-World War II beaches and park sections. No work went on in that park during World War II. As to removal of trees, the Monterey cypresses, the Monterey pines, the Coulter pine, and eucalyptus, and replacement by DPR with oaks and shrubs, there is no record of trees being planted in any park period that is currently under development after those planted by the CCC in 1939. All trees in the area are historic fabric, part of the designed landscape and should have to be replaced in kind, in same number. In all other issues, including fire safety, tree-pruning, forest management, and handicap access, these measures could have been mitigated through grants and special funding from sources from our federal, state, and local government, as well as from non-private and private organizations. Duncan McDuffie said, back in 1925, about the paving and the closing off of the roadbeds, and he said that some day they were going to lose what we have, and I see that happening in our state parks. Remember the words of Frederick Law Olmsted, in his “one is not to waste our resources,” he said one thing was specifically necessary and that was to “curb and limit activities of exploiters who would destroy the birthright of its successors no matter what its value for the sake of a quick turn of profit for themselves.” Parks should give us more than just a financial return, and they are there more not to generate funds, but to give us something that money can’t buy. And with the removal of the trees and the damage that you’re doing to the State Parks of Morro Bay, we’re losing that. Thank you for your time.

**Candace Vittitow, Individual** – Good afternoon, I’m Candace Vittitow. Copies of the Schulz Report and Wheeler Evaluation that I will be referring to have been deposited with your staff. Additionally, each commissioner has been provided a copy of this report on the historic significance of the campground. There is a written documentation of the eligibility of the site for the registry. As you look at the screen, be mindful of the previous energies of the park rustic and mid-century features of the campground. This should have been protected from institutionalized neglect. Outright discussions of the management at DPR, and the careless removal of historic species that DPR claims will be relocated and preserved. This wanton disregard for historic preservation has resulted in the significant loss of historic fabric and is rooted in the MOU that exists between the DPR and the OSP. If this MOU is not outright unlawful, and that is for you to investigate and determine, it is certainly a dismal failure. This is the Schulz Report, Inventory and Eligibility Assessment dated April 15, 2000,

produced by the Cultural Heritage Division of the DPR. This is a report on the historic status of the campground and it was meant to be in the EIR of this project. This is a report OHP expected DPR to produce in good faith. There are sixty pages of inventory, plans, photographs, and history of the sites, and an evaluation that were assembled by a team of four people over the period of a full year after a thorough on-site investigation. The conclusion was clearly stated. The CCC/WPA sections of the campground qualify for the historic registry, and the mid-century pieces were of such integrity that they too probably qualified. The language of the law mandates that if a site possibly qualifies, that site must not be altered in anticipation that it would be included in the registry in the future with all the protection that its designation provides. DPR failed this report, and two years later had DPR employee Elise Wheeler produce a 3-page document that effectively refused the Schulz empirical findings and allowed the DPR to disavow any cultural or historical significance to the site. In other words, it has allowed the unlawful destruction of historic features, including the alteration of the designed landscape by the cutting of the trees for the purpose of realignment of the campsite that increases the roadway from 10 feet to 20 feet and sometimes tripling the size of a paved campsite at first. And actually tree counting is not being provided by the DPR. They are claiming that they are going to cut less than 10% of 850 trees. The most recent count is somewhat in the area of 780 trees. All-in-all the ratio of the trees probably is the issue. They are going to take out... The proposed ratio of trees and shrubs will fulfill (inaudible). If you want to know what Morro Bay State Park campground will look like, you only have to look at San Simeon. Jim Quayle may well have stated to the Coastal Commission that they were going to maintain the flourishing landscape. The right thing to do is invalidate the MOU immediately and reinstate the Schulz report as the defining document of record and the EIR and follow the law. Please protect and preserve our call for heritage.

Chair Hart reminded the speakers of the value to the Commission of hearing new subjects rather than the repetition of subjects that had already been brought up.

**Chris Elliott, One Cool Earth** – Oh, this is totally new. It's related. First off, I'm a concerned citizen. I live in Cayucos, California, next to the Morro Bay Estuary Plan, and a national treasure. I also have a non-profit, and we have been trying to plant trees in those areas. One of the things that came to my attention by setting that up, was the use of herbicides inside the state park. I'm just going to show you a quick solution, something you might want to incorporate so you can cut down the herbicides, especially if you could start it next to the Morro Bay Estuary. So what we have here is... we don't have it. I'm just going to keep moving on. The Morro Bay Estuary is fed by different streams, and at this particular time the park system has a policy of using herbicides next to water inside the parks, exposing park visitors and the aquatic life in that area. Two of the herbicides, glyphosat. Glyphosat is not being used as heavily in Europe, Australia and New Zealand. A new system is available for the park system to look at. I'm not endorsing the product here, I'm endorsing that idea of a new system and a way of looking at using non-herbicide solutions. A hot foam solution is biodegradable. Doesn't have any impact. There is no drip. It has proven itself to be a positive system for people to embrace when they want to reduce herbicides in their environment. That's it. They don't even have this up, so we're done. And I have a handout if you want more information. Thank you very much.

**Kara Hagedorn, Individual** – My name is Kara Hegadorn, and I live in Morro Bay. I'm a wildlife biologist. I worked for New York State Parks for 12 years. I've traveled here today to be a voice for two pairs of nesting raptors in the Morro Bay campground. The safety of their chicks is currently being seriously endangered and the construction near those nest trees should be stopped. There are federal and state laws protecting nesting raptors. These nests were brought to the attention of the DPR in the summer of '03. But during a public action later on December 1st, Superintendent Greg Smith said that they were only squirrel nests in the campground. The next month when I was asked to look, I found two raptor nests that had been built and used in previous years. It's widely known that raptors do return to the same nest year after year. By March there was a red-tail hawk incubating



eggs in one of the nests, and a red-shouldered hawk in another. When the project did start in April at the height of nesting season, Parks had graders, excavators, lifters, and other heavy equipment directly under the nesting trees. They were grading, digging up asphalt, dumping pipes. Wednesday I videotaped a tractor trailer idling right under the red-shoulder nest, and then moved only 60 feet away as the lifter loudly dumped the asphalt into the truck. There has also been significant grading underneath the red-shoulder nest tree that may affect the life of that tree. Park personnel assured me that the hawks aren't disturbed at all, but during my volunteer monitoring I found that the adults did not do nest exchange or food delivery during construction time nearly as often as they did on the weekends. I also found eggshells from two of the hatched chicks from the red-tail nest, but so far I've only seen one chick. In April I met with Superintendent Nick Franco and gave him a list of suggestions to minimize disturbance to the nests. Except for sparing the nest trees, nothing else in the project plan has changed. The new main road comes in directly under the red-shouldered nest. Campsites and fire pits are scheduled to be built directly under the red-tail nest. Since it's your job to advise on policy, you should know that wildlife viewing is ranked the second most popular hobby in the U.S. People come from all over the world to camp in the Morro Bay Campground, and wildlife viewing is part of it. First, the DPR said there were no hawk nests. Then, short of cutting the trees, they did not minimize disturbance to the hawks, and they have not changed their plan to ensure their future. The next few weeks are critical as the young leave the nest and hop around in the branches of adjoining trees. I am asking you to make sure that heavy equipment stays far away from these nests. Tell them not to smash the asphalt road that runs perpendicular to the red-shoulder nest until the young have left the area. Tell them to sincerely save the nesting trees, plus the adjacent trees around them that provide shade for the nests. Thank you very much.

**Mary Green, Individual** – Good afternoon, my name is Mary Green. I'm a Morro Bay resident. My issues are documentation and some of the violations brought to your attention and observed by Ms. Winholtz, please enter this into your permanent record. Regarding the Morro Bay State Park trees, the Department of Parks and Recreation repeatedly made unpermitted cuts, and cut beyond permits. There are photos to substantiate each of these statements. Debbie, where are you? (Ms. Green was calling to an associate that was operating a slide presentation).

**Mary Green** – Oh, it isn't working at all? There were 13 trees cut in an historic (inaudible) grove that were not on the list to be cut. When they began to grow back they were poisoned. There were nine trees cut in Coastal Commission's original jurisdiction without permission, trees that were up to six feet in diameter. The county gave permission for seedlings to be cut. The DPR then girdled a grove of 24 trees in a viewshed and poisoned the ones that tried to survive. In another area they cut one-half of 75 wind row trees, in a recent acquisition of green belt property. When the deed was exposed the DPR said that they would stop, but they had already poisoned the remainder of the trees. Regarding the monarch butterflies, DPR officials continue to withhold information and mapping of the grove from the city. They refuse to consult with previous and known experts regarding the definition of grove and the proper treatment of the grove. They ignored the city's right to participate in the definition and documentation of the grove as stated in our land use plan. Improper trimming was done, damaging butterfly habitat, and they continue to allow camping with fire under the trees during butterfly season. Despite the Coastal Commissioner's direction, DPR has received permission to cut into the grove after apparently working a deal with Coastal Commission staff, and in addition, are cutting a through road that should have been protected habitat. During the course of all this unconscionable behavior, the butterfly exhibit at the State Park Museum was removed by DPR. I believe that should have been a very clear indication of their intention. If all the trees were removed and the campground paved, no more butterflies. No more maintenance. Please help us save our park. Thank you.

**Patti Dunton, Salinan Tribe** – Good afternoon. My name is Patti Dunton, and I live in Atascadero, which is near Morro Bay. I'm here today representing the Salinan tribe, as a verified Salinan Native

American. The tribe consists of Monterey, San Luis Obispo, and San Benito Counties. Like many indigenous people, our territory is defined by geologic features, which become part of our culture and defines our world view. We were a quiet, but dynamic people, but we've had to come out of our private life because of political pressure over developments that are in our traditional territories, and formed a sovereign nation, which is provided by the State of California. We work together to ensure our unique heritage is not lost, and that our connection to the land is not being overlooked. But when it comes to State Park projects in our traditional lands, we are being discriminated against by not being properly contacted and informed. Especially during this current project in the Morro Bay State Park, where impacts are being done to known burial areas, with lack of proper monitoring as it did say in the mitigation measures for this project. The Museum of Natural History in Morro Bay initiated a Native American Program and it was not put into action because of a certain State Park archeologist. I am a State Park docent, and I have been one for eight years, and I finally just got fed up with politics, so I said I just can't work with State Parks any more. Also as a docent, I know that State Parks knew the raptor nests were there. There are also owls that are in there. And everyday we would note where they were, because it is an aspect for people that come in and want to know where the wildlife is, so we would point them to the areas and we say we have raptors nesting here, nesting there, go look at them. So they knew they were there. So we encourage the Commission to develop a working rapport with our tribal government. We are documented as the first people of the Central California Region, and as such entitled to be part of the consultation and planning processes on projects and activities within our homeland. We are confident that you will help the departments under your administration understand our status and our rights to notification and communication, which we hold as indigenous native people, and as a sovereign government. Please, stop this project in Morro Bay before more irreplaceable impacts do occur. Thank you.

**George Stanton, Individual** – I'm George Stanton from Los Osos. We're appealing to you here today to uphold the policies that bind those you advise and to whom you present influential recommendations. Specifically, we plead with you to adjure the DPR to adhere to established policy regarding endangered species protocol, and to accommodate compelling community input. We ask you to advise the DPR to cease environmentally destructive developmental activity until credible investigation and review is undertaken and appropriate mitigation negotiated in regard to endangered species habitat and nesting area disruption and destruction, and paving and road locations. Statutory specifications for conducting surveys of the endangered species were not followed. Particularly as regards the Morro Shoulderband Snail. The crude survey notes obtained violate required protocol. No map was provided, documentation was incomplete, methodological procedures were not reported, and the time of the survey was not during rainfall. After authorities were informed of the lack of proper surveys, new surveys were conducted this past winter long after the coastal permit was granted, and snails were found. It is an egregious violation of policy that proper surveys were not made before the plans were created. Moreover, once the endangered snails were found, the plan should have been altered to protect the habitat, just as regulation specifically requires. Instead, Parks staff falsely reported that they had done the survey correctly with negative results, got their permit, and then astonishingly, actually proceeded to destroy snail habitat despite this very public controversy. We appeal to you to intervene and request immediate cessation of developmental activity until an appropriate course of action can be determined. One that complies with existing policies and regulations and which accommodates and preserves the special and treasured features of this area. The campground is rapidly being transformed from a picturesque thickly forested rustic multi-use haven into a thinly treed extensively paved wide open RV park, which is the antithesis of the spirit of the place. Should you decide not to act in accordance with our request, please help us to see why civil litigation would not be our only subsequent alternative and next step in seeking redress of these grievances. By explaining why what are widely perceived as contradictory policy interpretations and unjustifiable actions by the DPR can be permitted, and cite the policy areas you see as so vague and ambiguous as to permit the specific actions and inactions pointed out to you here today. Whose inter-

ests are being served by this project? Please consider seriously the extent of the public outcry of a multitude of local and statewide citizens, as well as the nature of their complaints about environmental preservation, stewardship and public trust, aesthetic sensibility, ecological responsibility, historical preservation, and the mitigation of a dismal environmental impact. All concerns which are congruent with the essential nature and stated mission of the Parks System. Thank you very much.

**Steve Mattieu, Individual** – Thank you. Steve Matthew, co-owner of AGP Video in Morro Bay, California. We operate six government access channels in that county, and to the California Coastal Commission, Fish and Game Commission, and just last week spent the week with CDF and with Fish and Game Commission in San Diego. I bring that forward, just to say that I'm real uncomfortable on this side of the mike. I'm generally on the other side, in fact, I feel that I get paid to stay on that side. However, being a Morro Bay resident, my significant other and partner is very attached to this park, and therefore I am as well. I have a 17-year-old son there. This park specifically means a whole lot to him. His grandfather is one of the guys that actually helped build this park, that did the rock work, planted all of those trees back in the '30s. We live in a house in Morro Bay that's adobe that was built in 1934. I'm simply here to support what these people have brought forward to you as facts. What they aren't bringing forward to you is that a plane was chartered to come here to try and get this message through, because nobody has been listening. Obviously, I have a rudimentary understanding of how the process works, having videotaped some 4,000 meetings in the last eight years, so I realize that it's real late, it's way down on the line, but I would urge this board to if at all possible, red tag this project, fall back, take a look at it. I personally would like to see it get restored entirely, to its original condition. I realize that that's next to impossible, but I do think that something has been overlooked here and would urge you to do what you can do. Thank you.

Chair Hart asked if there were any other registered or unregistered or speakers. There being none, Chair Hart asked Rick Rayburn, Chief of State Parks' Natural Resources Division to address the public comments on Morro Bay State Park.

Mr. Rayburn stated that concerns about the Morro Bay campground project had been expressed for a number of years, and that each of the issues raised today had been raised previously by specialists on State Parks staff. Mr. Rayburn stated that the apparent conflicts had arisen from State Parks' efforts to preserve cultural resources, preserve natural resources, and provide recreation at the same time. He provided some history on the campground at Morro Bay State Park and its development by the Civilian Conservation Corps in the 1930s, and State Parks' attempts to rehabilitate the campground while mitigating impacts to the site's many resource values. He discussed the tree removal and replanting, and the protection of cultural and natural resources in a developed area. Mr. Rayburn clarified that in regard to Native American issues, State Parks works with the tribal unit identified by the Native American Heritage Commission, and that in this case the Chumash Tribe had been identified. Regarding endangered species, Mr. Rayburn stated that State Parks was well aware of the endangered species that could potentially be impacted by the project, and that they had worked closely with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to carry out the required protocols in dealing with the endangered snails. Regarding raptor nesting, Mr. Rayburn stated that it was necessary to remove trees to accommodate the appropriate infrastructure for the campground, and he noted that trees were not being removed during the March-September time period when raptors nest in this area. He stated that while he could not speak to the specifics of the construction work at the site, he would investigate what was being done. He also noted that he was confident that State Parks was aware of how this issue should be managed. In regard to the Monarch butterflies on the site, Mr. Rayburn noted that the Monarchs are present from mid-October through winter. He pointed out that State Parks manages and preserves eucalyptus, Live Oak, other Monarch roosting trees throughout California, and that no tree removal would take place when Monarchs were in the area. Mr. Rayburn concluded by saying that he had heard some issues today that he was going to investigate, but that he wasn't confident that more could be done to balance the need to provide a sound recreational facility for the

public while protecting the park's natural and cultural resources. He then asked if there were any questions from the Commission.

Commissioner Cotchett asked about the Coastal Commission revocation hearing that had taken place, and the vote of the commissioners at that hearing. Mr. Rayburn replied that he did not know the vote at that hearing, and he explained that the issue of a misstatement on State Parks' application to the Coastal Commission for this project had been dismissed. He added that the holding of a revocation hearing did not mean that State Parks had falsified documents or made intentional misstatements. Commissioner Cotchett and Mr. Rayburn discussed the construction project, when construction began and the costs involved.

Chair Hart asked if there were any other comments from the commissioners. Chair Hart then stated that this was something she was concerned about, and that she believed that all of the commissioners were concerned that these citizens had made an effort to travel to Santa Rosa and deliver the testimony that had been heard. Chair Hart stated that State Parks staff were also concerned, that staff were present and had heard what was said, and would respond in an appropriate fashion. She also stated that something needed to be worked out, and that she had faith these citizen's efforts would prove to be worthwhile.

Commissioner Eastwood stated that earlier in the meeting the commissioners discussed tree removal as it related to Angel Island and Morro Bay, and that he had observed considerable controversy. He stated that State Parks should analyze the situation, and that one shouldn't act on, for example, the decision of three members of the Coastal Commission staff. Commissioner Eastwood advised that the subject was worthy of investigation.

Chair Hart stated that when the Commission hears the sort of public testimony that was heard today, they are likely to agree that staff should investigate. Chair Hart added that the Commission would like to hear a report about the Morro Bay campground project and the testimony heard today at its next meeting, specifically what kind of discussions occurred and what kind of resolutions were reached. She asked if the commissioners agreed that this should occur. The commissioners present agreed that it should. Chair Hart asked that such a report be presented at the next Commission meeting, and she expressed her hope that the results of this would be positive.

Commissioner Scherman addressed the Chair, clarifying that the Commission would probably not meet again for two months, meaning that results should not be expected within 30 days. Chair Hart concurred that the Commission typically meets every-other month.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Hart asked for a motion to adjourn. Motion Commissioner Witt, second Commissioner Scherman. Chair Hart adjourned the meeting at 2:27 p.m.

ATTEST: These minutes were approved by the California State Park and Recreation Commission on July 16, 2004, at its duly noticed public meeting in Los Angeles, California.

By: ORIGINAL SIGNED BY \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 7-16-04

Louis Nastro  
Assistant to the Commission  
For Ruth Coleman, Director  
California Department of Parks and Recreation  
Secretary to the Commission