

CALIFORNIA STATE PARK and RECREATION COMMISSION

Asilomar Conference Grounds - Merrill Hall
800 Asilomar Boulevard
Pacific Grove, California

Minutes of the Meeting - Friday, September 17, 2004

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Joseph Cotchett
Raquelle de la Rocha
Clint Eastwood, VICE CHAIR
Caryl Hart
Bobby Shriver, CHAIR
Paul Junger Witt

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Gail Kautz
Sophia Scherman
Phillip Tagami

STATE PARKS STAFF PRESENT

Ruth Coleman, Director
Ken Gray, Senior State Park Resource Ecologist, Monterey District
Dennis Hanson, Superintendent, Monterey Sector
Phil Jenkins, Superintendent, Monterey District
Tim La Franchi, Chief Counsel
Tom Moss, Senior State Park Resource Ecologist, Monterey District
Louis Nastro, Assistant to the State Park and Recreation Commission
Stephanie Price, Asilomar Sector Superintendent
Paul Romero, Chief Deputy Director

SPEAKERS REGISTERED/REPRESENTING

Mark Blum, El Sur Ranch
Norm Channell, Individual
Lygia Chappellet, Coast Watch
John Fischer, Individual
Larry Horan, El Sur Ranch
Bill Nye, Individual
Alan Perlmutter, Individual
Peter Pethoe, Hostelling International/HI USA
Rosemary Robert, Central California Council, American Youth Hostels and Monterey Hostel Society
Joyce Stevens, Individual
Doug Williams, Central Coast Lighthouse Keepers and Point Sur Volunteers

CALL TO ORDER

Legal notice having been given, this meeting of the California State Park and Recreation Commission was called to order at 9:31 a.m. by Chair Bobby Shriver. Chair Shriver introduced the commis-

sioners present, along with State Parks Director Ruth Coleman and Chief Counsel Tim La Franchi.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE JULY 16, 2004 MEETING IN LOS ANGELES

Chair Shriver asked if the commissioners had reviewed the draft minutes of the July 16, 2004 meeting in Los Angeles, and then asked for a motion to approve the minutes if they had met with the commissioners' approval. Motion Commissioner Cotchett, second Commissioner de la Rocha. The commissioners voted unanimously to approve the minutes as submitted.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

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

End of Summer Update – Director Coleman noted that summer campsite occupancy levels had been high, and that the additional 5% of campsites made available this year through State Parks' advance reservation system had sold out. The Director noted that the demand for campsites continued to significantly outstrip the supply of campsites in California. Director Coleman stated that while figures were still being compiled, it appeared that park visitation had remained steady in spite of the increased user fees that became effective July 1st, 2004. She added that as of July of this year the number of reported crime incidents in state parks had decreased by 9%.

Budget Update – Director Coleman reminded the commissioners that this year's State Parks budget had been reduced by \$15 million. She stated that the limited revenue data available for July and August indicated that the \$15 million reduction would be offset by the increased user fees that went into effect on July 1st. The Director added that this conclusion was based on preliminary data and that progress would continue to be tracked on a month-to-month basis.

California Performance Review – The Director described the California Performance Review report prepared at Governor Schwarzenegger's request by a specially-assembled team. The report proposes methods for reorganizing state government to create efficiencies and reduce costs. She noted that the sixth of seven regional public hearings on the report was being held today in Fresno. At this hearing, and others like it across the state, a panel received public testimony on the California Performance Review report and discusses the possible impacts. Director Coleman explained that State Parks held that many of the recommendations in the report could have a positive effect on the department, but that there were some recommendations that could potentially have a negative effect. The Director noted that the department had shared its comments on the report with the Secretary of Resources. She explained that at the end of this month (September 2004), the public input process would conclude, and that the public comments would then be considered by a commission-like body created for this purpose that would then forward its recommendations to the Governor. Director Coleman explained that before implementation the recommendations could go to the Little Hoover Commission, the legislature, or could be sent to voters for approval. She noted that some of the recommendations could be implemented administratively by the Governor.

Hearst Ranch Acquisition – Director Coleman announced that the State Coastal Conservancy recently voted unanimously to approve the acquisition of a conservation easement at the Hearst Ranch (in San Luis Obispo County) for State Parks. The Director explained that this amounts to approximately 1,500 acres and 18 miles of shoreline gifted to State Parks in fee title. She noted that State Parks had been concerned that the agreement originally included stipulations that limited access to the coastal trail, but that negotiations with the landowner resulted in a lifting of all restrictions. The Director noted that the acquisition still must go before the state Public Works Board for approval, but that this would be the final step in the process. She also noted that State Parks did not contribute funds to this acquisition.

Performance Management Report – Director Coleman noted that each commissioner had received

a copy of State Parks' Performance Management Report. She noted that the Schwarzenegger administration had made it clear that they wish to move state government towards performance-based budgeting, and that this report is State Parks' first step in this direction. The Director stated that State Parks was already familiar with performance-based budgeting practices, having been selected to participate in a pilot program to implement performance-based budgeting in the 1990s. She noted that State Parks was revisiting the necessary data collection methods and activities required to budget in this way. The Director explained that with a performance-based budget, inputs and outcomes are closely measured to ensure they are balanced. She noted that while the Performance Management Report was not lengthy, it contained a large amount of information, including measurements of how well State Parks is meeting the needs of the public. Director Coleman noted that in creating the Performance Management Report, State Parks discovered that public demand for interpretative programs was steadily increasing while the availability of interpretive programs continued to decline. She noted that the Performance Management Report and performance-based budgeting dramatically illustrated issues like this, and would allow State Parks to identify gaps between what park users would like to see and what State Parks is able to provide.

High Speed Rail – Director Coleman noted that State Parks had recently submitted its comments on the proposed California high speed rail system. The Director explained that the Environmental Impact Report for the project revealed it could affect 22 state park units, particularly Henry Coe State Park and the Cornfield and Taylor Yard properties in Los Angeles. She noted that State Parks' 59-pages of comments detailed many deficiencies in the proposed project. She also noted that funding for high speed rail would likely be placed on a ballot for voters' approval at some time in the future.

Stanford Mansion – Director Coleman announced that Martin Vale of Berkeley had been appointed as Executive Director of the Stanford Mansion. Mr. Vale has two decades of experience as a hotel general manager. The Director explained that the Stanford Mansion restoration project is nearly complete, that the work inside the house is nearly done, and that furniture is beginning to arrive. She noted that bids were being accepted for the restoration of the mansion grounds, and that State Parks hoped to hold a grand opening celebration for the mansion in the spring of 2005.

Coastal Cleanup Day – The Director noted that tomorrow, September 18th, 2004, is the 20th annual Coastal Cleanup Day. She noted that hundreds of volunteers at many state park units would be participating in this important event.

Devil's Slide Tunnel – Director Coleman noted that last Friday, September 10th, Governor Schwarzenegger signed a bill that directs Caltrans to repurpose land that had been intended for an overland bypass on Highway 1. Instead of a highway, a tunnel will be constructed in the area known as Devil's Slide. The land that was to be used for the highway has been deeded to State Parks to allow for valuable connectivity at Andrew Molera State Park, which had been previously bifurcated by the Caltrans property. The Director noted that the new Devil's Slide tunnel should lessen the likelihood that slides would make it necessary to close Highway 1 in the future. She added that while work on the tunnel was now underway, if for some reason the tunnel could not be completed the land would revert to Caltrans ownership. The Director noted that State Parks was pleased to be working with Caltrans and the State Coastal Commission on this project.

Director Coleman concluded her report.

Chair Shriver thanked Director Coleman and asked if there were questions on the Director's Report.

Commissioner Cotchett asked Director Coleman for details related to the \$15 million budget reduction and the degree of success that had been measured in compensating for the reduction with increased user fees. Commissioner Cotchett asked if, since the increase went into effect on July 1st, actual numbers were available for July and August, and if a projection could then be extrapolated for the balance of the year.

Director Coleman replied that she did not have the revenue figures with her, but that this information could be provided to the commissioners. The Director also noted that while she did not have the exact figures available, it was her understanding that revenue had been consistent with staff projections. She added that it was difficult at this point (two months into the fiscal year) to determine whether or not the increased fees would offset the budget reduction, as attendance at many parks will be dependent on weather conditions. The Director noted that Huntington State Beach in Orange County had been experiencing high attendance almost every day, and she added that a large portion of State Parks' revenue comes from units like Huntington State Beach.

Commissioner Cotchett asked if the amount of the fee increases had been calculated to cover the \$15 million budget reduction.

Director Coleman replied that as a precaution the fee increases had been calculated to compensate for an \$18 million budget reduction. The Director also noted that State Parks was experimenting with charging different fees at different units, and with adjusting fees during times of peak use. Director Coleman cited Hearst Castle as an example, where fees are being reduced during times when attendance is traditionally low. She noted that when attendance is low at Hearst Castle it has a dramatic effect on the local community because park visitors make such a significant economic contribution to the area. The Director explained that with fees being adjusted in this way it will be difficult to project the results. She added that State Parks was attempting to manage fees more like a private sector business, adjusting fees where it is possible to ascertain the appropriateness of the charges.

Commissioner Cotchett thanked Director Coleman.

Chair Shriver asked if there were any other questions for the Director. There being none, the Chair introduced Monterey District Superintendent Phil Jenkins to read the names of employees who had recently retired from careers at California State Parks.

CHAIR'S REPORT - RECOGNITION OF EMPLOYEE RETIREMENTS

Superintendent Jenkins thanked the Chair and noted that many of the names he was about to read were staff members he had looked to for training and assistance early in his own career. The Superintendent added that many of these people had made valuable contributions to his experience with State Parks and that it was gratifying to see them reach retirement.

Al F. Akins, Northern Service Center	5 years, 3 months
Patricia K. Autrey, Field Services Division	32 years, 7 months
Kenneth G. Burton, San Diego Coast District	28 years, 9 months
David M. Collins, Folsom Sector	17 years, 7 months
Gary Fregien, Natural Heritage Sector	36 years, 10 months
Frank Madrid, Sr., Pajaro Coast Sector	21 years, 3 months
Ray L. Monson, San Diego Historic Sector	21 yrs
Wardell T. Noel, Silverado Sector	28 years, 9 months
Rubin L. Ortiz, San Diego Coast District	21 years, 8 months
Karis A. Pierce, Accounting Section	4 years, 9 months
Dennis D. Roesberry, Bay Sector	26 years, 7 months
Gary Shook, Valley Sector	31 years, 3 months
Bettina S. Townsend, Colorado Desert District	30 years, 2 months
Donna E. Zaugg, Santa Cruz Mountain Sector	16 years, 10 months
Nancy C. Zehnle, Lake Tahoe Sector	16 years, 5 months

Chair Shriver stated that it was fantastic that these individuals had had such long careers with State Parks, noting in particular that one individual had served for 36 years. The Chair thanked each of the

retirees on behalf of the Commission and the people of California.

APPROVAL OF SPECIAL REDWOOD GROVES

Chair Shriver read the resolution to establish a special redwood grove as requested by Save-the-Redwoods League.

As Requested by Save-the-Redwoods League:

Byron D. Sher Grove in Mill Creek State Park

Chair Shriver made a motion that the resolution establishing this grove be adopted by the Commission. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Cotchett. The commissioners voted unanimously to adopt the resolution establishing this special redwood grove.

PUBLIC HEARING

Chair Shriver opened the public hearing portion of the meeting at 9:46 a.m. The Chair noted that during this portion of the meeting the Commission would hear from members of the public regarding the general plan projects that would be considered by the Commission today. Chair Shriver invited members of the public who wished to address the Commission to complete a speaker registration form to aid the Chair in his management of the meeting. The Chair also explained that time limits would be imposed on the speakers. He also explained the timing light system that would be employed, and asked that members of the public please adhere to the Chair's authority regarding time limits and conduct of the meeting.

Consideration and action on the Department's proposal for approval of the Preliminary General Plan and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for Asilomar State Beach and Conference Grounds

Chair Shriver introduced this agenda item and asked if any of the commissioners had questions for staff before he opened this item for public comment. There being no questions, Chair Shriver introduced the first speaker:

John Fischer, Individual – Good morning, John Fischer, Pacific Grove. I'm one of the few that responded to the EIR, there were not many. But there was one recurring issue for several of us and that is what appears to be a long, long delay in disability improvements. In the eighties, or late seventies, or early eighties, I was on the City of Los Angeles ADA committee for the mayor, who happened to be Tom Bradley at the time. And there was much pressure at that time to get those city buildings up to date. And I know funds are always a problem. Recently, in the last few years, there's been another push to do it. We now have people that are going all over the state of California suing small businesses for their lack of having ADA improvements, whether they're really a fair approach to it. But this place has had a need, I've had friends who've stayed here, have not been able to get anywhere because the van was broken down, and when they got there it was hard to get into the places. So to me this is an area that is long overdue for Asilomar to improve itself. I realize these buildings, a lot of them were built with Julia Morgan's design when ADA was not an issue, but it has been an issue for 30-some years in this country, and it's about time that whoever manages this park, that it be taken seriously. And it be taken seriously by everyone, because you have people that visit here that do have problems especially if the equipment breaks down. And it has in the past. I don't know what they're using today. The other thing is I do want to congratulate what I've been hearing, and what appears in this program to revert this place to the appearance of the twenties and thirties. To take out some roads, to do some of those things. To give it the feel of Julia Morgan, to give it the feel of the, what was it, the Young Women's Christian Association approach to it. When Fred Farr had this turned over, or requested that this become State Parks, I'm fairly sure at that time there was not

a desire to make it look like a motel/hotel. And certainly a lot of local people do not want it to become Spanish Bay North, which means no t-connections in the rooms, no televisions in the rooms. If there needs to be, let it be in the AD building. This is by definition a refuge by the sea. And it is not a Spanish Bay type of resort. Thank you.

Chair Shriver thanked Mr. Fischer for his comments. The Chair recognized Commissioner Hart, who addressed Mr. Fischer.

Commissioner Hart pointed out that universal access to park facilities was a stated goal of the general plan for Asilomar State Beach and Conference Grounds that the Commission was considering today. She also noted that the general plan recognizes that a significant portion of California's population has a disability, and she emphasized that compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act was a stated goal of the general plan.

Chair Shriver asked if there were any other speakers or comments from staff on this agenda item. There being none, the Chair closed public comment on this item and asked for a motion to approve the Preliminary General Plan and Environmental Impact Report for Asilomar State Beach and Conference Grounds. Motion Commissioner Hart, second Commissioner Cotchett. The Commissioners voted unanimously to adopt the resolution approving the Preliminary General Plan and Environmental Impact Report for Asilomar State Beach and Conference Grounds.

Consideration and action on the Department's proposal for Naming and Classification of approximately 25 acres of Asilomar State Beach and Conference Grounds as a Natural Preserve subunit

Chair Shriver introduced this agenda item and asked if there were any questions from the Commission or comments from staff before the item was opened for public comment. The Chair then opened public comment and asked if there were any registered or unregistered speakers on this agenda item. There being none, the Chair closed public comment on this item and asked for a motion to approve the establishment of approximately 25 acres of Asilomar State Beach and Conference Grounds as a natural preserve subunit named Asilomar Dunes Natural Preserve. Motion Commissioner Eastwood, second Commissioner Witt. The Commissioners voted unanimously to adopt the resolution establishing approximately 25 acres of Asilomar State Beach and Conference Grounds as Asilomar Dunes Natural Preserve.

Consideration and action on the Department's proposal for approval of the Preliminary General Plan and EIR for Fort Ord Dunes State Park

Chair Shriver introduced this agenda item, noting that the Commission had participated in an on-site briefing at Fort Ord Dunes State Park the previous day. Chair Shriver thanked Monterey Sector Superintendent Dennis Hanson for being the Commission's guide on their orientation to this incredible local resource. The Chair then asked if there were any questions from the Commission or comments from staff before the item was opened for public comment. There being none, Chair Shriver noted that he would be calling the speakers in the order they had registered:

Joyce Stevens, Monterey Bay Dunes Coalition – Good morning Commissioners. I'm Joyce Stevens, and I want to speak in favor, very much in favor of approval of the preliminary general plan and the EIR. I thought that maybe a little local background on this subject might help you. In 1985, a group of us formed the Monterey Bay Dunes Coalition. And we adopted the southern part of Monterey Bay to keep the development off the coastal strand west of Highway 1. And we spent some years opposing development, west of Highway 1. We used various coastal appeals, a little cajoling and a little legal action too. And it was quite successful, since for about ten years there were only two buildings built in that 12 mile stretch. Then in the 1990s, the early 1990s, the Big Sur Land Trust came on board to help us. And they put together this report. By that time they had thought that

a Monterey Bay State Seashore might be the best venue for protecting the coastal strand. So this book was put forward, and it was used as a tool to promote a piece of legislation which then Assemblyman Sam Farr carried and I believe it was 1995 that the legislation passed and was signed to create the Monterey Bay State Seashore. Ta-da!

Chair Shriver noted that staff would assist Ms. Stevens with the display boards she had brought.

Joyce Stevens – Okay. The Monterey State Seashore as framed in the piece of legislation goes 50 miles from Natural Bridges State Park down to Point Joe. And in that area there were already all these state beaches. As a matter of fact, the total span of state beaches in the 50 miles was about 25 miles, so it was about half there. There was no money that was accompanied with that legislation, so nobody got mad at that point. And, but now, speaking for this specific item, I have a very personal interest in the Ford Ord beach because I was the staff architect at Ford Ord for 23 years, from '62 to '85, and I kept arguing with all my colonels that the area west of the highway shouldn't be shot up, it should be made into a park. Which would make them apoplectic, which was always fun (laughter) But anyway, so I'm just more than delighted to have this on the agenda. And you can see where Ford Ord fits in. It's approximately 4 miles of the seashore, and that will add 4 miles to the 25 already.

Chair Shriver noted that Ms. Stevens' time had elapsed, but that he didn't wish to stop her when she had been so successful arguing with colonels, given that his rank was far less than colonel (laughter).

Joyce Stevens – Okay. So that's about all I wanted to say, so hip-hip-hooray and thank you very much, and for taking action on this.

John Fischer, Individual – John Fisher, Pacific Grove, again. I want to thank you all for allowing me to join you all in the tour yesterday at Ford Ord. As you all know, I may have been the only member of the public there, but in any case I do thank you. It was very educational. And I do like where the proposals are for the campsite and the use of the bunkers where necessary. The one area that I do not, and of course, we're still (unintelligible) on, the concerns about the retreat of the shoreline is important to all of us. There is interest by me, and some others in the fact that snowy plovers have now returned apparently to Ford Ord beach. The north, way up north I guess it is but in that general area. The one thing I do have concern with were some of the questions about, they seem to be saying "why do we need to tear up the ice plant?" And yes it's expensive, but about ten years ago or more, people started tearing up ice plant as volunteers here. Tom Moss can speak to what was done here. There's a group that did it out at Seaside. And they helped plant the native plants. So that might, albeit some of these people have now aged a half a generation, there may be a whole new generation that would be very willing to be part of anything in the process to take out that intrusive, pervasive species. It is pervasive. If you're familiar with kudzu and some of these other things that grow because there is no enemy of them, in our area, in this country, they grow, grow, grow. And ice plant is one of those. So hopefully you will take care and include that. Thank you.

Chair Shriver noted that State Park Resource Ecologist Tom Moss had led the Commission on a site briefing that morning to observe the dune restoration work at Asilomar.

Rosemary Robert, Central California Council, American Youth Hostels, & Monterey Hostel Society – I'm representing the Central California Council of American Youth Hostels, and the Monterey Hostel Society. I mainly want to thank State Parks for taking over from National Parks the part of Fort Ord that is to be a hostel in the future. So, that's an appreciation. The other thing is I had been told, I was not on the tour yesterday, if I had known about in time I would've been, that there is a hostel site in the plan, as part of the State Parks plan.

Chair Shriver asked Ms. Robert for clarification that she was asking if there was a hostel proposal included in the general plan.

Rosemary Robert – Yes, that's a question.

Chair Shriver recognized Monterey District Superintendent Phil Jenkins, who stated that State Parks Resource Ecologist Ken Gray had been involved with the hostel proposal for Fort Ord Dunes. Superintendent Jenkins suggested that Ken Gray provide a brief update on the hostel.

Resource Ecologist Ken Gray explained that State Parks had been working with American Youth Hostels for many years to develop a hostel site at Fort Ord. He explained that the proposed general plan identified a small parcel east of Highway 1 as a potential youth hostel site, but that this property was being considered for a potential land exchange, making the site an unlikely location for a hostel. Mr. Gray noted that State Parks had worked with American Youth Hostels to sponsor an application for conveyance of a parcel adjacent to the California State University Monterey Bay campus for use as a hostel site, but that the negotiations had not yet been completed. He added that the National Park Service had approved this application, but that final negotiations for conveyance of the property, either to State Parks or to American Youth Hostels, were still underway.

Chair Shriver thanked Mr. Gray and asked if Ms. Robert had any other questions on this subject or if she had any further comments.

Rosemary Robert – No.

Chair Shriver asked if there were any other registered or unregistered speakers on this topic. There being none, the Chair closed public comment and asked for a motion to approve the Fort Ord Dunes State Park Preliminary General Plan and Environmental Impact Report. Motion Commissioner Hart, Second Commissioner de la Rocha.

Commissioner Cotchett stated that he wished to discuss this item, noting that he would be remiss if he did not put on record his concerns.

Chair Shriver asked Commissioner Cotchett to proceed, noting first, for the benefit of the members of the public present, that both Commissioner Cotchett and Commissioner Eastwood had served in the military at Fort Ord. The Chair explained that it had been fascinating to visit the facility with these two commissioners the previous day, being able to hear them point out the various locations and activities, etc.

There was a brief procedural discussion before Commissioner Cotchett continued.

Commissioner Cotchett stated that he had very much enjoyed visiting the site of the former Fort Ord military base the previous day. He noted that when he and Commissioner Eastwood were there as soldiers there were approximately 40,000 people at Fort Ord. Commissioner Cotchett added that their experiences there made Fort Ord a special place. Commissioner Cotchett stated that while he did not wish to spend a great deal of time on the subject, he did want to point out that the U.S. Army planted ice plant at Fort Ord in 1940 or earlier to stabilize the dunes. Commissioner Cotchett stated that he was concerned about the cost of removing the ice plant, and that while he was not suggesting that State Parks had not planned a wonderful program for rehabilitating the dunes, he was wondering if there wasn't a way that isolated areas of ice plant could be left intact for those who appreciated it. He referred to Chapter 2, page 29 of the Fort Ord Dunes State Park General Plan, and he noted that much time could be spent arguing about what was and was not "native." Commissioner Cotchett asked about the cost of removing the ice plant at Fort Ord, and what he asked about the rationale behind pulling it all out or anilallating it with chemicals.

Commissioner Cotchett noted that in putting his comments on record, it was his hope that staff would be reminded that California is facing the reality of a serious financial deficit, and that now more than ever there are finite amounts of money and other resources available for State Parks to accomplish the things they wished to accomplish. Commissioner Cotchett noted that when he had asked earlier about the cost of eradicating ice plant he did not receive a conclusive answer. He stated that he had serious concerns about the cost of eradicating ice plant, and that with such severely limited resources it was inevitable that the Governor and the citizens of California would be asking for

accountability in the cost of government. He noted that the general plan included no cost-benefit analysis for the ice plant eradication project. He concluded that while he supported the establishment of Fort Ord Dunes State Park, he wanted to know what costs would result from the Commission's voting to adopt the Fort Ord Dunes State Park General Plan.

Chair Shriver asked State Parks Director Ruth Coleman to respond.

Director Coleman replied that the two most costly elements of the general plan were likely the proposed campground and the ice plant removal. She explained that the general plan represents a 20-year vision for Fort Ord Dunes State Park, which is typical of park unit general plans. She noted that development costs could be provided for the campground, but that it was likely it wouldn't be built for many years, until funds became available. She noted that cost estimates provided in the general plan would certainly be out of date by the time development took place. Director Coleman explained that the purpose of a park general plan is to allow State Parks to establish a vision for the unit, so that if funding becomes available in the future, State Parks could build a campground or perform whatever other development work was necessary to satisfy the needs of park users. The Director noted that park general plans were similar to city zoning plans in that they allowed certain types of development in specific areas. She pointed out that zoning plans did not incorporate the cost of development, but that they merely made this development possible in the future. Director Coleman added that at one time park unit general plans contained a great deal of specific detail, but that State Parks discovered this detail was highly restrictive in that by the time development was taking place the details were no longer relevant and it often became necessary to conduct a lengthy general plan amendment process. Director Coleman noted that it was likely the funding for removal of ice plant would be included as part of mitigation component of a habitat conservation plan for the park. The Director explained that recovering endangered species often involved increasing the carrying capacity of the existing land base, and that this would likely include replacing non-native plants like ice plant with plants that offer habitat and food for the species in question.

Commissioner Eastwood asked about the future availability of funds that had been mentioned by Director Coleman. He asked what would occur in the future if a large-scale project such as ice plant removal is underway and the funds run out. Commissioner Eastwood added that perhaps he and Commissioner Cotchett were at a disadvantage in that when they served in the military at Fort Ord in the early-to-mid 1950s the grounds had been so blasted by ordinance that nothing grew, and that by contrast the ice plant appeared quite attractive. He noted that if the ice plant could be replaced by equally attractive native grasses and plants that would support native wildlife, that would be an acceptable alternative, but that there remained the question of the costs involved and the possibility that the project would have to be abandoned for lack of funds at some future date.

Director Coleman noted that native plants would not be restored until the funding was available to complete the restoration project. If planting was being conducted as part of a mitigation program, completion of the project would be a condition of the mitigation. Mitigation would require that funds be available not only for the original planting, but also for at least the first three years of maintenance, as the first three years are when the costs are highest. Director Coleman also noted that while State Parks' long range vision was to remove all the ice plant, this, along with the development of the campground, was many years away. She noted again that what the general plan does is allow these projects to take place if and when funding becomes available, and that in the case of the campground, the general plan also defines the area where this development would take place.

Commissioner Eastwood noted that the youth hostel proposal discussed earlier was not mentioned during the Commission's visit to Fort Ord.

Monterey District Superintendent Phil Jenkins explained that the youth hostel proposal was not part of the general plan, but that it was a separate project involving American Youth Hostels, the National Park Service, California State University Monterey Bay, and State Parks.

Chair Shriver asked Director Coleman if a budget for removing the ice plant could be provided to the Commission.

Director Coleman replied that cost information could be prepared and sent to the commissioners.

The Chair recognized Commissioner Hart, who stated that she thought it would be a good idea to include cost information in any report to the Commission pertaining to park units where major restoration efforts were taking place. Commissioner Hart then asked Chief Counsel Tim La Franchi what would be required of State Parks to comply with the Endangered Species Act and the California Environmental Quality Act as the general plan for Fort Ord Dunes is implemented.

Chief Counsel La Franchi explained that the Endangered Species Act requires that there be no “take” of species that are listed or protected under the Act. He noted that implementation of the general plan would require consultation, biological assessments, and a determination of impacts that could result in take. If take would result, the proposed development or activity could not proceed until either the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, California Department of Fish and Game, and other consulting agencies, had determined that the measures that were adopted for that activity were sufficient to avoid take. If it was determined that take of species was necessary, an extensive public habitat conservation plan process would be implemented, in compliance with NEPA or CEQA requirements, and an application for an incidental take permit would have to be made.

Commissioner Hart clarified that she wished to know whether or not a Habitat Conservation Plan had already been prepared for the Fort Ord property, and whether or not there would be any special requirements for State Parks because the department was acquiring habitat with an existing Habitat Conservation Plan.

Resource Ecologist Ken Gray responded. Mr. Gray explained that the property could be acquired without obligation, but that if proposed development created a potential for incidental take of species, a Habitat Conservation Plan would be required. He noted that while there is a Habitat Conservation Plan being developed for the 28,000-acre military base, State Parks is only acquiring about 1,000 acres of the the property. Mr. Gray further explained that he was currently reviewing the first draft of the base-wide Habitat Conservation Plan, and that the plan called for the conservation of certain lands that would allow for other lands on the Fort Ord property to be developed with the loss of some endangered species habitat. He noted that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would require State Parks to agree to restoration programs, conservation activities, and monitoring for long-term sustainability of the endangered species that are present. He also explained that a Habitat Conservation Plan is essentially a contract between the regulatory agency and the land managing agency, in this case allowing a certain degree of incidental take of endangered species, as long as other measures are taken to conserve those species, the end result being no net loss of habitat.

A brief discussion took place during which Commissioner Hart and Resource Ecologist Ken Gray talked about the Habitat Conservation Plan for the Fort Ord area, how it related to Fort Ord Dunes State Park, and the importance of the relatively small portion of the Fort Ord property to be operated by State Parks to the entire Fort Ord area. Commissioner Hart stated that she thought it would be worthwhile to see a copy of the draft Habitat Conservation Plan.

Commissioner Cotchett noted that Tom Moss had provided the cost of roughly \$5,000 an acre to remove the ice plant. He stated that \$5,000 per acre multiplied by 1,000 acres equals \$5 million. Adding a \$5,000 per acre maintenance cost to this for three years equates to a total expenditure of approximately \$20 million. Commissioner Cotchett stated that while these were only very rough figures, they did illustrate the costs involved. He also noted that State Parks had recently hoped to acquire an important piece of property north of Monterey at a price of \$10 million, but that funds were not available to complete the acquisition. Commissioner Cotchett emphasized that with the finite resources available, State Parks must be very careful about the projects it chooses to fund, and

should perhaps consider that ice plant removal is not as important as certain acquisitions, and that perhaps ice plant or some other “non-native” plant set for eradication could be left alone. Commissioner Cotchett reiterated that all of this underscored the importance of including cost analysis information in the general plans for park units.

Resource Ecologist Ken Gray explained that State Parks was annually allocated a certain amount of money for statewide habitat restoration and management. He noted that not every project is funded but that the highest priority projects come first. Mr. Gray explained when the economy was strong more funding would be available, but that it could take 20 or 30 years to accomplish the proposed habitat restoration. He also noted that there is a great deal of local public interest in habitat restoration, and that this, along with the assistance available through California State University Monterey Bay, provided opportunities to minimize state expenditures on these types of projects.

Commissioner Hart noted that she believed preserving endangered species on park property should be one of State Parks’ highest priorities, and that if necessary the department must identify alternative methods to fund endangered species restoration and preservation. Commissioner Hart agreed with Ken Gray that volunteers, mitigation fees, etc., could provide alternatives to using state funds.

Commissioner Cotchett stated that he agreed with Commissioner Hart. He then asked Ken Gray if he had any insight as to when the “good economic times” Gray referred to could be expected (laughter). A brief good-natured exchange between Ken Gray and Commissioner Cotchett ensued, during which it was revealed that Mr. Gray did not have any insight into when good economic times could be expected. Commissioner Cotchett concluded that he was “just wondering” about this (more laughter).

Chair Shriver asked if there was to be any more discussion on this agenda item. There being none, the Chair reminded the Commission that there had been a motion on the floor to approve the Preliminary General Plan and Environmental Impact Report for Fort Ord Dunes State Park (Motion Commissioner Hart, second Commissioner de la Rocha). The Commissioners voted unanimously to adopt the resolution approving the Preliminary General Plan and Environmental Impact Report for Fort Ord Dunes State Park.

Consideration and Action on the Department’s proposal for approval of the Preliminary General Plan and Environmental Impact Report for Point Sur State Historic Park

Chair Shriver introduced this agenda item. The Chair thanked Sector Superintendent Lois Harter, who had conducted the Commission’s site visit to Point Sur State Historic Park. Chair Shriver also thanked Doug Williams, Point Sur volunteer and member of Central Coast Lighthouse Keepers, for acting as the Commission’s guide and for the fantastic restoration work his group had accomplished at the Point Sur Lighthouse.

Commissioner Cotchett asked the Chair if the volunteer members of Central Coast Lighthouse Keepers who were present could please stand and be recognized. The members stood to enthusiastic applause.

Chair Shriver opened public comment on this agenda item, noting that six public speakers had registered. The Chair called the first speaker:

Norm Channell, Individual – Good morning. If we could shift a little bit from the Army at Fort Ord to the Navy down at Point Sur, I’m a retired Navy captain and I have some experience in the matters regarding the Point Sur Naval Facility. I strongly support creation of the park down there. Point Sur has provided important support to the Navy and to mariners for years in the form of a lighthouse, for navigation, and in the form of providing crucial information to the Navy during the Cold War and the tracking of Soviet ballistic missile submarines that operated off that coast. I’m very familiar with that, one of the jobs I had was intelligence officer for the fleet, in Hawaii, and I used the input from

the Naval facilities, including the one at Point Sur, to do a daily assessment, hourly assessment if you will, of the activities of the ballistic missile submarines that were on patrol off our coast. If you're not familiar with those, the Russians kept two of them on patrol out there continuously. Each one had 16 ballistic missiles on board, with a one megaton warhead on each missile and you can imagine where they were targeted. So I think we can do a lot of work down there, for interpretative purposes. Much of what the Navy has done in that area was and still remains classified, but I think there's sufficient information that we can do some nice interpretative work down there, and I have offered to provide my help to get that interpretation together and to conduct tours. I did give Lois a note of caution when we talked about this down at Big Sur, that you need to kind of move along because those of us who are familiar with this kind of thing aren't going to be around that much longer (laughter). So, and also I'm pro bono so I help with your budget problem. And I think also the Navy, I know that the Navy still has a facility down there, it's a Naval postgraduate school, and I taught at the Naval postgraduate school for nearly 15 years, and I think I can help in that regard too. And I think if you can work out some kind of partnership with the Navy, why there might be some cost sharing benefits there as well. I live down near there and I'm willing to help. I think it's an important crucial aspect of the Cold War, and this is a golden opportunity that the state has to preserve some of this. Thank you very much. If you have any questions I will try to answer them.

Alan Perlmutter, Individual – That was an important phone call (referring to an earlier cell phone ring). I apologize for that but I forgot to turn it off. My daughter calling from college and she wasn't even calling for money (laughter).

Commissioner Cotchett noted "That's a rarity, sir" (more laughter).

Alan Perlmutter – So if you'll excuse that. First of all, my name is Alan Perlmutter, I'm a longtime resident of Big Sur and I'm the owner and proprietor of the Big Sur River Inn, long established inn and lodging facility in Big Sur. And, what I came to talk to you about this morning has to do with the very difficult problem that we have in Big Sur for housing, affordable housing for employees and people who work in Big Sur. Before this general plan got underway, several of us spoke to the people in the park system about the possibility of making some arrangement to use the, I think it's 24 houses, that are on the property there, I think it's 24, some number like that, and we were told at that time that would be impossible, that ultimately those have to be taken down. They referred to a number of reasons, the infrastructure, the plumbing, the electrical wiring, the asbestos in the buildings and so on. And that they would be taken down and not used, so it was something that we couldn't even consider. Sometime after that, people were housed there, there are people living in those homes now, the local Highway Patrolmen live in those houses. I think that a number of State Park employees, and perhaps Caltrans employees, live in those homes. Some of them are still unused. But nevertheless, the situation was that we were told at one time they couldn't be used, then they are used. I continue to persist in this effort to see what could be done about having some joint effort of the State Park, Monterey County, and local people, local business people, create some kind of joint force, something that doesn't exist now, to do something about creating some plan for having some kind of housing at Point Sur. In the summer of 2002, I went to speak to Lynn Rhodes (inaudible) beginning to be formed, you ought to get in on it, so I did. I wrote a letter in November of 2000...

Chair Shriver noted that Mr. Perlmutter's three minutes had expired, and asked if Mr. Perlmutter would please conclude his comments.

Alan Perlmutter – I didn't know that I had a time. I was unaware of that. I heard people talking at least this long. Nevertheless, I wrote in November of 2002, that letter was ignored. I then wrote again in March of this year and that letter has been included, although it was not included in its entirety, and I felt that what I've been talking about has been given a short shrift by the planning group, and perhaps even ignored. So, instead of, as I prepared to read the letter of November, I'd like to submit the letter of November, I'd like to resubmit my letter of March, November 2002, and the let-

ter of March of this year, for consideration by this planning team. What I'm really asking is something that's out of the box. It could be a different approach where the park system could be a good neighbor to our community and to help us alleviate this very, very difficult problem that exists.

Chair Shriver thanked Mr. Perlmutter and stated that the Commission would be happy to accept his letters as part of today's proceedings.

Commissioner Hart asked if Mr. Perlmutter's letter had been included in the comments and responses of the Point Sur State Historic Park General Plan.

Chair Shriver clarified that one of Mr. Perlmutter's letters had been included in the general plan but another was not, and that Mr. Perlmutter was asking for the Commission to be able to see the letter that had not been included. It was noted that Mr. Perlmutter's letter of March 26, 2004 appeared as comment number 11 in the general plan.

Chair Shriver reminded those who wish to address the Commission that their time would be limited to three minutes for individuals representing themselves and four minutes for those representing groups. The Chair also called speakers' attention to the timer that displays their remaining time.

Mark Blum, El Sur Ranch – Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. It's starting at four minutes and I'll happily gobble those up. As you know from your visit yesterday, the El Sur Ranch is a working cattle ranch, and these facilities, the lighthouse and the NavFac, are inholdings in the El Sur Ranch so there's a very, close important relationship. Cattle grazing is going on right between these facilities. The El Sur Ranch has worked with DPR on this plan. I and my partner Mr. Horan have met with staff and talked about the preliminary document and submitted two letters which are in the final EIR, and another letter that was sent to your yesterday which you should have before you.

Chair Shriver noted that the Commissioners had the letter that had arrived the previous day.

Mark Blum – Thank you. Unfortunately, I'm here to tell you today that the responses are inadequate as far as the ranch is concerned. Both in terms of policy, and legally in terms of the EIR content. With three minutes or so I'll only have time to give you the briefest outline of the concerns. I'll touch on the headlines and as time permits I'll come back to specifics, but I'll ultimately refer you to the correspondence for the details. We're concerned with the claim that the facilities are historical or culturally significant, the State Office of Historic Preservation has twice rejected that. And we feel that is simply a self justification for retaining these buildings for maintenance purposes, contrary to the stated purpose of acquiring the NavFac in the first place. There's no water source for this facility. No legally permissible adequate water source. DPR is in the process of attempting to develop a water supply, and has applied to the county for permits to develop a water supply, but we feel it's premature to be planning a park and making fiscal commitments and capital improvement commitments without an adequate water supply. And I can tell you as a representative of developers in this county, that people are not allowed to develop without a water supply. We also know that that's a difficult process. The El Sur Ranch applied for an appropriation permit to apply our water in 1992. The EIR started almost immediately. We're still in the process, 12 years later. We don't have an EIR yet for that water supply. The GP lacks a fiscal analysis. We think it's essential that at least a preliminary fiscal analysis be done at a cost of operating and maintaining this facility, and that adequate public dialogue cannot take place without that. The EIR analysis is deficient in a number of respects. There are no water demand assumptions. This point is that if DPR insists that these are historically significant facilities, then it needs to analyze the significance of demolishing the facilities, and the facilities that were already demolished without any analysis. We don't agree that they're significant, but if they are, then it's appropriate to analyze that, and that's not done. There's no full biological analysis. It's acknowledged that there will be impacts on snowy plover. This is the only beach between San Luis Obispo and Monterey Bay that has snowy plover on it. It's a pristine beach, it's never had any public access. It's acknowledged that there'll be impacts, but there's no mitigation

whatsoever. And that is not permissible. The El Sur Ranch categorically exempts physical access to the beaches at the base of the rock, as inconsistent with its cattle operation. There's no attempt to reconcile those in the plan. And finally, the plan should omit the goal of expanding the park. This is a very unique park. It's based on two existing facilities, a lighthouse and a naval facility. They have unique internal characteristics that are geographically limited by Moro Rock and the boundaries of the facility. The concept of expanding those into a private cattle ranch, which is under a conservation easement, and the public has paid \$12 million to preserve, is just utterly inconsistent with private property concerns. And we would strongly object to that policy language remaining in the document. Thank you. I refer you to the letters for any further detail. And I'm available for any questions.

Chair Shriver recognized Commissioner Cotchett, who asked Mr. Blum to please repeat his last statement.

Mark Blum – Yes, the El Sur Ranch is under a conservation easement. The County of Monterey... Commissioner Cotchett noted that Mr. Blum's client was paid \$11.2 million for the easement.

Mark Blum – Correct. And the El Sur Ranch made a \$4 million donation because it was a bargain sale. So the County and the El Sur Ranch jointly created that easement to alleviate public concerns about future development. So everything that you see from the highway is under conservation easement. There's no threat of development of that property. So there's no justification to expand a park to preserve the land, in as much as it's already preserved. The El Sur Ranch doesn't contribute historically to either of these facilities. It has its own historic values, but it adds nothing to the naval facility history or the lighthouse history, so there's no historical justification to expand into the El Sur Ranch. And finally, the El Sur Ranch is a priority use under the local coastal plan. It's a high priority use, it's a protected use, it's a coastal agricultural use, and as such, expanding the park into it is just inconsistent. And finally it's not for sale. Mr. Hill's not interested in selling the El Sur Ranch for park purposes. So, to have a policy in the plan that says it would be appropriate to expand these facilities, necessarily means taking park land and we object to that.

Commissioner Cotchett stated that he was familiar with Mr. Blum's law firm, and that he recognized Mr. Blum's senior partner among those present today. Commissioner Cotchett added that while he had the highest respect for the firm and their work, he was confused on Mr. Blum's last point. Commissioner Cotchett stated that he saw no mandate in the general plan to expand the park into El Sur Ranch.

Mark Blum – Oh no, I would agree sir.

Commissioner Cotchett apologized for having misunderstood Mr. Blum's point, and asked Mr. Blum to confirm that the Commissioner's understanding of the plan was correct.

Mark Blum – All that I find is policy language that allows for that to happen.

Commissioner Cotchett stated that, as discussed earlier in today's meeting, the policy set forth in a park unit general plan is meant to allow State Parks to consider the available options as far as 20 years in the future. The Commissioner reiterated that nowhere in the general plan was it suggested that it is State Parks' intent to expand the park at the present time.

Mark Blum – I don't suggest that it does. I think just the potential is enough to make the El Sur Ranch extremely concerned.

Commissioner Cotchett then asked Mr. Blum about the concerns raised pertaining to water. Commissioner Cotchett stated that the state owns six and one-half acres in an area called The Springs. He asked Mr. Blum if it was his position that there is no water available in this area.

Mark Blum – Right. We believe that that is mis-surveyed and that the springs are located elsewhere. If the state's able to find water up there, that's wonderful, but we have been going through a very

lengthy water process ourselves and we wish them luck. We think it would be prudent to wait until they have the water secured and then do the preliminary planning for this park.

Commissioner Cotchett asked Mr. Blum if he was saying that a separate water source should be identified instead of transporting water to the two existing water facilities.

Mark Blum – No, no, I'm simply saying that the process of permitting that water source and developing that water source that should be a bird in the hand before moneys are expended on capital facilities for this park.

Commissioner Cotchett asked if Mr. Blum thought that it would be logical to have water available before development was undertaken at the naval base.

Mark Blum – Frankly, I can't tell. The facility is an existing facility. It exists now based on water that's trucked in, that activity is in violation of local plans, that can't continue. I'm just concerned about a commitment to capital improvements and programs at a programmatic level, before any water source has been established. And based on our experience, it could be a decade or more before water is established.

Chair Shriver asked if there were any other questions for Mr. Blum. There being none, the Chair called the next speaker:

Larry Horan, El Sur Ranch – Good morning Mr. Chairman, members of Commission. Larry Horan. I will restrict my comments to some history because I think there is a significant potential for approving a general plan for this park. But I think it's premature today to do that, not for the reasons that my partner mentioned. But just quickly a little history. The Hill family conveyed the naval facility to the United States government in 1957. The current Mr. Hill's father, Courtland Hill, felt, as the captain addressed the Commission earlier, that it was an important thing for the United States during the Cold War to have available to the country this monitoring capability. Courtland Hill was a very patriotic man and he never for a moment went back on that conveyance. When the park was conveyed, excuse me, when the property was conveyed for park purposes, from the federal government to the state, a lot of emphasis was placed on the fact that the structures that were there were essentially inimical to the existing plan. It has a very decent and laudable history as a naval facility, and I think whatever's done there needs to recognize that event, whether it's historic, the State Historic Preservation Office does not believe that it is, but be that as it may, certainly whatever is done there needs to incorporate that. I serve as a trustee of the Naval Postgraduate School, and I know that the Naval Postgraduate School maintains a continuing interest in seeing that whatever park purposes the property is put to, recognizes that historic use, and certainly the Hill family has no opposition to that, since they were in fact creators of that entity, by that conveyance. But we need to take a very close look at how to integrate the park under the general plan with the existing agricultural use of the ranch. The 3,550 acres of the 7,100 acre ranch that are in scenic conservation easement, are everything you saw in your tour yesterday, south of the mouth of the Little Sur River to Molera, and the mouth of the Big Sur River. That's a permanent scenic conservation. The only retained use is agriculture, and therefore, you need to proceed with utmost caution as to how you interface the existing agricultural use which is a coastal act priority, with whatever the general plan contains. Housing is a problem in Big Sur, there's no question about it. We would be happy to work with Mary Trotter who chairs the local advisory committee, with Alan Perlmutter who spoke to you, to address the housing shortage. But it is really not appropriate to address that housing shortage by putting affordable housing in the middle of the scenic viewshed that was the result of an \$11-plus million expenditure by the state, and a \$4-plus million bargain sale gift by our client. And therefore I only urge you to defer action on this until we can work out some of the details that are obviously not addressed in your current plan draft. I'm ready to answer any questions if you have them. Otherwise, that's all I have to say.

Chair Shriver asked Mr. Horan if when he stated he would be willing to work with locals on affordable housing, if he meant at a site other than Point Sur.

Larry Horan – Well, I mean in Big Sur. I think we need to examine very carefully Molera Park, I think we need to examine, I think as Mr. Perlmutter said, we need to get the community involved beyond the lip-service level to do something, because it's a very real problem. But I don't think this current draft of your proposed general plan adequately addresses that.

Chair Shriver recognized Commissioner Cotchett, who stated that he knew Mr. Horan as a distinguished and honorable lawyer, recognized in the legal profession throughout California. Commissioner Cotchett stated that the Commission was honored to be addressed by Mr. Horan, and that he (Commissioner Cotchett) was delighted to hear Mr. Horan say he would work with State Parks. Commissioner Cotchett added that Mr. Horan, with his influence in the local community, was exactly the type of person State Parks needed the assistance of. Commissioner Cotchett referred to Mr. Horan's concerns about affordable housing, pointing out that the eight or nine housing units at Point Sur State Historic Park were occupied by California Highway Patrolmen, State Park Rangers and staff, and their families. Commissioner Cotchett explained that these public servants exemplified the need for affordable housing in the area. The Commissioner also noted that the general plan did not propose the construction of new housing, and he pointed out that having the current facilities occupied helped to preserve the naval base as Captain Channell had noted earlier. Commissioner Cotchett asked Mr. Horan if, when he stated that the Commission's consideration of the general plan was premature, was Mr. Horan suggesting that the Commission should vote against adopting the general plan today and then revisit the subject in three years. Commissioner Cotchett asked Mr. Horan if he would candidly share his thoughts on this.

Larry Horan – No I wouldn't, Joe. I wouldn't have the Commission do that at all. When these matters were addressed at the Big Sur Multiagency Advisory Committee, the idea of sunsetting the use of those buildings to allow an interim use by Highway Patrol, by the people that provide the security and the basic life of that community, that was discussed. And the idea was that they would find substitute housing and that those would be used for those necessary community members until adequate substitute, actually better if you will, accommodations were provided. And that was part of this commitment that there would be a sunset period. Rather than a permanent utilization of land which is really in the middle of the critical viewshed. But no, I'd be the last person in the world to want to turn my back on providing adequate housing for Highway Patrol and Parks employees. Because they're a necessary part of the community. I just don't think the plan, I think the plan kind of pushes that one down the road. And I don't think it ought to be. And that's one of the reasons I suggested a deferral. But you're absolutely right, that's a critical element that's needed in the community.

Commissioner Cotchett stated that he valued Mr. Horan's opinion, and he asked Mr. Horan if his suggestion would be to add a sunset provision, a specific date after which the use of the existing buildings as housing would end and the buildings would be demolished.

Larry Horan – Yes, in other words...

Commissioner Cotchett apologized for interrupting Mr. Horan to explain that while he could not speak for the other commissioners, Commissioner Cotchett believed that the demolition of many of the old Navy buildings would be acceptable so long as the historic nature of the facility was preserved as Captain Channell had earlier suggested.

Larry Horan – No, no, not at all. I think they can and I think the interim use of the housing is not inimical to the existing plan. But the way the current draft is worded, it circumvents the real crunch that exists down there for affordable housing, versus preservation of the viewshed, and preservation of those things for which the state has advanced substantial sums of money. And so, that I think is worth study. I don't mean it should be deferred indefinitely, because we're all aware of deferrals, and

it needs to be addressed. But I think this draft doesn't solve that problem, and I urge you on that basis to simply defer and allow us to work with park staff and with others in the community to see if we can't really get a plan that doesn't create those problems.

Chair Shriver asked if Mr. Horan or his partner Mr. Blum could identify the specific language that they were objecting to and the pages on which it appeared in the general plan so that the commissioners could be aware of it.

Larry Horan – Sure, I'd be happy to get the draft if I might.

Chair Shriver stated that this discussion would be delayed while Mr. Horan identified the specific language in question.

Larry Horan – Yes, I'll bring it back. Thank you.

Chair Shriver noted that he would be calling the remaining speakers while Mr. Horan identified the general plan language he was concerned with. Chair Shriver then called on next speaker, noting that Doug Williams had been the Commission's guide for an excellent orientation to the Point Sur Lighthouse the previous day:

Doug Williams, Central Coast Lighthouse Keepers and Point Sur Volunteers – Good morning. Thank you for this opportunity to speak. I'm Doug Williams, the present chairman of the Central Coast Lighthouse Keepers, a nonprofit organization which has been in existence for the last 11 years. And, for today's purposes, essentially our function is as the cooperative association for Point Sur State Historic Park. We supported the fundraising, both to support the volunteers, we recruit the volunteers, we educate the volunteers, we administer them, we do all these things. So we man the park in essence, as well as raising funds. We've raised about \$2 million, and over the last six years, we've restored four of the historic seven buildings. I want today, with the limited time I have, I'd like to address the problems that we see from the point of view of public access to Point Sur State Historic Park. First of all, it's extremely limited. It's restricted to the rock. And as I like to put it, it's restricted to the very patient and the courageous and the healthy, physically healthy people who can make it up the rock. You were driven up there yesterday. We have to, all the visitors have to walk up that and then walk down again. And presently there is no access to the naval facility, although it's been part of the park for the last four years. The main thrust however is the unsafe entry and exit to the park off Highway 1. So I'm talking as the troops from the ground. We're the ones that run the tours, we meet the people at the gate. Remember this is busy Highway 1. An estimated two million cars go by there every year, and at the times of the many race meetings out at Laguna Seca, we've got people speeding along that stretch, it's the only straight stretch for miles and miles. Motorcycles, cars, who think they're still on the racetrack. So we've got 85 volunteers who give typically 275 tours for 6,000 visitors a year. To allay some fears, we can see no increase in the traffic across the ranch or up the rock, even onto the new expanded park, because it's restricted by the number of ...

Chair Shriver noted that Mr. Williams time had expired but asked him to please continue.

Doug Williams – I apologize. As an ex-college professor I usually speak for 50 minutes (laughter). At any rate, so we expect no increase across the ranch, but we feel at the gate, at the highway, it's an accident waiting to happen. The visitors enter and exit on the busy road. We don't just open the gate and let them in. We have to screen them, for those that are physically able to do it, or have the time, and so on. There's a lot of coming and going, people taking off, and so on.

Chair Shriver asked Mr. Williams if he believed his stated concern was adequately addressed in the general plan.

Doug Williams – Yes, I think so. If I might just suggest a solution to this. What we would, are in favor of is adaptive reuse of at least three of the buildings on the naval facility, which would allow us a tour marshalling site, museum, interpretive center, allow us to expand our interpretation to the

naval facility and the Native American community, and so on. And also, many of the tours have to be canceled because of bad weather. So it'll give us a chance to show videos and a virtual tour of the lighthouse. So we urge approval of the general plan as a reasonable compromise among the competing interests and concerns and we feel it allows restoration of the scenic viewshed by removing many of the buildings while providing safe, and enhanced access by the public to their expanded park. Thank you very much.

Chair Shriver introduced the next speaker, noting that the speaker represented Coast Watch and citizens of Big Sur. The Chair asked if he had pronounced the speaker's name correctly:

Lygia Chappellet, Coast Watch – Correct, Lygia Chappellet. And I'll say some of the citizens of Big Sur because I'm sure I don't have the exact support of everybody. I definitely do represent Coast Watch. I want to take you back for about, well when the Navy turned the property over to the State Parks, at that point we had meeting after meeting after meeting, probably for two years were there meetings convened, with all the different heads of agencies, as well as several concerned citizens. And during that time, there, we came to a near consensus, near because the State Park was the only one not in full agreement. And, the consensus, or near consensus was that the dream of having that coastal prairie be free of all buildings, and that the Navy base buildings would disappear, and would revert back to pastoral grazing territory, would not be fenced, really was what was put forth in those meetings, and was supported by all the agencies and most of the people that came there. I think that might still be possible. And still also taking into concern, and taking into consideration the housing needs that we do have. What was proposed at that time, and I'd like to put forth again, is that going back into Molera and looking for spots within the Molera State Park that are not as visible, not on the scenic easement plateau there, would be a more appropriate siting for future housing sites. Also, the interpretation for Navy historical, for the historic park, if it can be done at the lighthouse, I know you're crowded up there, and appreciate that's a huge effort to use that space well, but the whole dream of having that pastoral coastal prairie opened to the visual corridor and not interrupted, and not created as another destination, is still something that we're looking forward to going through with. And I know that's not exactly how the plan is written at this time. Thank you.

Peter Pethoe, Hostelling International/HI USA – My name is Peter Pethoe and I'm involved with the Central California Council of Hostelling International, HI USA. And hostels are low cost dormitory-style accommodations in the neighborhood of about \$18 per person. And we are thankful that we've had a good relationship with the State Parks Department. And quite a few hostels around the coast that are operated by HI, and are on public land. And, for instance, Redwood National Park, Point Reyes Hostel, Marin Headlands, Fort Mason, Montera Lighthouse, Pigeon Point Lighthouse, Santa Cruz, and some others in public parks. Sacramento used to be a public park at City Hall, but now it's got moved back to where it came from. And there's also Saratoga and so forth. So we have a beautiful hostel in Monterey now, a forty bed hostel. And, there's also one in San Luis Obispo. But, we need a connection. It's quite a distance between the various places. So there is in Big Sur land LCP, there is provisions for a hostel in the Big Sur area. There has been some talk with the State Parks Department about having either a hostel at Big Sur or at, what do you call it, Pfeiffer Big Sur State Park, there may be some buildings that may become available. So my hope is that there is something incorporated here that a state park could be established. There's a lot of talk about the viewshed but if you, I drove by the Point Sur thing, and there's a lot, trees are covering most of the buildings. The viewshed, because of these trees is not being effected very much. And I suggest that if other buildings are, if this concern about buildings, that trees be planted so it won't affect the viewshed, you won't be able to see the buildings. But we do need, we do desperately need public access, low-cost public access to the coast for bicyclists and a lot of overseas visitors... Am I...

Chair Shriver interrupted Mr. Pethoe to note that his time had expired, and reminded him to conclude his comments. The Chair added that the Commission had heard understood Mr. Pethoe's comments and understood his objective.

Peter Pethoe – Thank you very much.

Before closing public comment on this agenda item, Chair Shriver asked if Mr. Horan had identified the language in the general plan that was the source of his concern.

Larry Horan, El Sur Ranch – Yes Mr. Chairman, members. It's the, and I've got the pages, it's not a specific affirmative statement in the plan, it's the converse, it's the omission of the sunset with which I was addressing the Commission before, that is "...we will use these housing facilities temporarily until substitute housing facilities can be found." That's the omission. And the other thing is the maintenance concept. There was never any discussion at the Big Sur Multiagency Advisory meetings or elsewhere, that there would be retention of any of the buildings for maintenance and utility purposes. And the reason for that was that the housing that would be the temporary housing is to some extent, as you've observed, masked by the cypress that intervenes between the highway and that housing. And so those are the least problematic. But the inclusion of maintenance facilities was not contemplated. It runs beyond the, it's a convenience certainly to have maintenance in the middle of the viewshed there, but inimicable to the plan. So those are the two things in the plan. It isn't one...

Chair Shriver asked Mr. Horan to clarify that there isn't a paragraph or language in the general plan that he wished to have changed.

Larry Horan – ...if we could tweak a sentence or a paragraph, that would be a different thing, but I do think those issues need to be addressed.

Chair Shriver thanked Mr. Horan.

Larry Horan – Thank you.

Chair Shriver noted that the Commission had heard the last registered speaker, and he asked if there were any unregistered speakers on this agenda item. There was one unregistered speaker:

Unregistered speaker – I want to thank you very much for this opportunity. One of the biggest problems on the whole Big Sur coast, and I live down there, is affordable housing. And not just for state employees, be it Highway Patrol, State Parks or other. It's people who work in the community, who are private citizens. There is no such thing as affordable housing between Monterey and San Luis Obispo County. This is one opportunity here that location to possibly provide that housing for service connected employees, the different hotels, what have you. And to delete the housing altogether makes it even harder for these individuals to have local housing. A lot of those people commute now from miles and miles away. And, I believe right now there are 28 units, most of them duplexes, that could be rehabbed to some degree, and they are hidden behind a tree line at this point. And I feel that should be looked at. And with all due respect to the hostel, there's a lot of public facilities down there already. But we're not providing anything for the local workforce. Thank you.

Chair Shriver recognized Commissioner Cotchett, who asked Mr. Perlmutter, who had addressed the Commission earlier regarding affordable housing in the Big Sur area, where his employees at the Big Sur River Inn live and commute from. Commissioner Cotchett asked Mr. Perlmutter to address the Commission from the microphone so all could hear his response.

Alan Perlmutter – Glad to have the opportunity, thank you. In November of 2003, when I wrote the original letter, I mentioned that 30% of our employees commute from town, which would be Monterey, Seaside, Marina, and even Salinas. It's more than that now.

Commissioner Cotchett interrupted Mr. Perlmutter to ask him to explain the times and distances involved for those who may not be familiar with the Big Sur area. Commissioner Cotchett also asked the number of people Mr. Perlmutter employed at the Big Sur River Inn, and he pointed out that the locations Mr. Perlmutter named were all north of Big Sur. The Commissioner asked how far south employees would have to travel to find housing.

Alan Perlmutter – It's 30 miles (down and back, roughly an hour each way). Seventy (employees). Yes. In the summer it's 70, in the winter unfortunately it diminishes somewhat. But 70 in the summer when the traffic is at its height. Well, we don't have any employees that live out of Big Sur that come from the south, because the nearest community would be Cambria or San Luis Obispo, 70, 80, 100 miles away. The problem is, we have no employees, that don't live in Big Sur, that drive from the south, it's just from the north.

Commissioner Cotchett noted that it was not practical to commute from the south to Big Sur because of the distances involved.

Alan Perlmutter – We've had employees who drive from Gorda which is 40 miles.

Commissioner Cotchett thanked Mr. Perlmutter.

Chair Shriver noted that a citizen who had addressed the Commission earlier wished to speak again. He informed this person that he was not going to accept rebuttal, and that the speaker would not be heard again at this time unless there was a question from a commissioner. The Chair apologized to the speaker and closed public comment on this agenda item. Chair Shriver then asked if there was to be any discussion amongst the commissioners on this item.

Commissioner Cotchett stated that he was in favor of the general plan for Point Sur State Historic Park, and that he understood the comments made by Mr. Horan and his partner. Commissioner Cotchett stated that he was planning to vote to adopt the plan, and that he hoped Mr. Horan and his law firm would continue to work together with State Parks. Commissioner Cotchett also stated that he was very concerned about the housing issue raised by Mr. Perlmutter, adding that he believed State Parks staff should give this issue every consideration when implementing the general plan.

Commissioner Eastwood noted that he was a long-time resident of the area and that he could remember Point Sur before the Navy housing existed. The Commissioner noted that the decision of whether or not to retain the housing at Point Sur State Historic Park was a particularly difficult one, given that while it would be desirable to have the entire area as open space, the housing of Highway Patrol and State Parks staff was also very important.

Commissioner Witt stated that he was a part-time resident of Big Sur, and that he was aware of the difficulties experienced by employees traveling to and from the area. He added that the commute challenges mentioned could be even more difficult during adverse weather and peak traffic. The Commissioner noted that while it did not come under the purview of State Parks to provide housing, the commissioners and State Parks staff were keenly aware of the issue given some of the distances park staff must commute. Commissioner Witt noted that if and when the appropriate agency can assist in providing housing, the Commission would consider and be supportive of such opportunities.

Chair Shriver asked if there were any other comments from the commissioners. There being none, the Chair asked for a motion to approve the Preliminary General Plan and Environmental Impact Report for Point Sur State Historic Park. Motion Commissioner Hart, second Commissioner Cotchett. The Commissioners voted unanimously to adopt the resolution approving the Preliminary General Plan and Environmental Impact Report for Point Sur State Historic Park.

Consideration and action on the Department's proposal for the Naming & Classification of approximately 15 acres of Point Sur State Historic Park as a Natural Preserve Subunit

Chair Shriver introduced this agenda item and asked if there were any questions from the Commission or if staff had anything to add to the information the Commission had already received. There being none, the Chair opened public comment on this item and asked if there were any registered or unregistered speakers. There being none, Chair Shriver asked if the commissioners wished to discuss

this item. The Chair then asked for a motion to adopt the resolution before the Commission to establish approximately 15 acres of Point Sur State Historic Park as a Natural Preserve subunit with the name Point Sur Dunes Natural Preserve. Motion Commissioner de la Rocha, second Commissioner Cotchett. The Commissioners voted unanimously to adopt the resolution approving the establishment of approximately 15 acres of Point Sur State Historic Park as a Natural Preserve subunit with the name Point Sur Dunes Natural Preserve.

Open Public Comment

Chair Shriver introduced this agenda item and noted that there was one registered speaker. The Chair asked the speaker to state the subjects on which he would like to address the Commission:

Bill Nye, Individual – Actually, there are two issues I'd like to speak to. Number one is, and I hope this won't affect my time, maybe I can get an extra minute or so here. Number one, down the coast there's a place called Garrapata State Beach. In regards to allocation of funds, sometime back when the state acquired that beach, they put in stairs that go down through the pucker brush and parking alongside the highway, down to the bluff. Those stairs have in the past completely deteriorated to where they're almost nonexistent. The newer stairs put in to go from the bluff down to the beach, those stairs have also all but disappeared, making it very dangerous to go down there. I would like to think that somewhere along the line, some funds could be allocated to fix that up. And on another matter, there's an issue that's coming forward, I believe to Caltrans and the County, to change an entryway at Pfeiffer State Park. In order to do this, I understand they want to put in a turn lane, a southbound turn lane, and remove some mature redwoods in order to accommodate that. A brief history here, my dad's parents came here in the twenties and my mother's parents came here in the thirties. I was born at Fort Ord in 1947. And as Mr. Cotchett stated, for his children and grandchildren to see things the way they've always been, it's always been a policy in the Big Sur Coast to not allow paved turnouts, turn lanes, or signage along the highway. I don't understand why it should be a necessity to change the highway in front of that state park. If you can do it there then pretty soon you're going to have a turn lane at Garrapata State Beach. Or at the River Inn, or various other places up and down the highway. And so I would like to think that State Parks would reconsider their request to put in that turn lane, and take out mature redwood trees at the entrance to the park. Thank you.

Chair Shriver asked if there were any unregistered speakers on items of general interest to the Commission. The Chair recognized John Fischer:

John Fischer, Individual – John Fischer, Pacific Grove again. I'll bring you local now. As you know the state park, Asilomar State Park, runs north along the ocean. There's some residential properties, and then there's the Coast Guard property, which is the seaward of the road, and the landward where the golf course is. The federal government right now is finishing work on transferring that property to the City of Pacific Grove. The City of Pacific Grove is not going to be capable of taking care of the seaward side. The landward side, the golf course has a trust, has a fund that takes care of it. The seaward side for that, I would urge you to be strongly proactive in working with the city and any other agency on ownership of that, just because it will just add some additional acreage to the 108 acres that are already Asilomar State Park. The local police department and the rangers from here can certainly monitor it, and there's no absolute need right now to spend a nickel. There's work that has to be done, there's protection that needs to be done, it has endangered species. It has tidepools that are a huge argument in this community, and to some others up and down the coast that are very concerned with tidepools. Tidepools are Fish and Game, tidepools may also be under the Rocks Conservative that the 11,000 rocks up and down the coast of California. These agencies do work together to protect. I think it's very important that you as a board, work with the city through staff, to take over that land once the city gets it. So it's protected, the endangered species are protected, and the tidepools have an agreement between all the necessary agencies to protect them. Thank you.

Lygia Chappellet, Coast Watch – Two things. The housing at Big Sur, it is a big issue, it just does not all need to be solved at that one spot at Point Sur, and to have temporary housing there makes great sense, as long as we look for better solutions for the future. Mr. Nye, I agree with you, I've been on a lot of committees, a lot of, spent a lot of time in trying to keep our highway looking like it is without a lot of extra turnouts and signage, but in this case, in front of Pfeiffer Big Sur State Park, about two or three weeks ago we had, I'm not sure if it was a fatal accident or a very severe one, but the turn in for that park is deadly, and it's because one, you can't get out of the way of the traffic, and it's speeding up right there, and also because there's a phone pole to the right which keeps anybody who wants to go around you from being able to do so. So you get pushed into the traffic, if everybody's not on their Ps and Qs. So something needs to be done there. Maybe not take out redwoods, but certainly a widening of the road, getting rid of the phone pole and some safety measures.

Chair Shriver asked if there were any other unregistered speakers for Open Public Comment. There being none, the Chair asked if there were comments by the Commissioners on any other matter.

Commissioner Eastwood stated that he was concerned about the recent incident reported in the press, accurately or not, in which it appeared that grant funds administered by State Parks had been used for special interest projects. Commissioner Eastwood noted that many of the commissioners, himself included, had not been aware of the incident until it appeared in the news media, and that he wanted to have an additional discussion on this subject at the Commission's next meeting.

A brief discussion took place during which Commissioner Cotchett described what he thought State Parks staff should provide for the Commission on this subject: 1) An overview of the grant programs administered by State Parks, 2) What procedures are currently in place that allowed the unfortunate incident described in the press, 3) What procedures and/or policies can the Commission adopt to ensure an incident like this will not occur again. Commissioner Cotchett stated that it was tragic that an incident like the one in question could occur and reflect negatively on the fine staff and volunteers of California State Parks. The Commissioner reiterated that State Parks and the Commission must do everything within its authority to prevent this sort of incident from occurring again.

Commissioner de la Rocha, Chair Shriver, and Chief Counsel Tim La Franchi discussed the necessity of making this request a formal Commission action. It was decided that the Commission was making a request of staff and that a motion was not necessary. Chief Counsel La Franchi clarified that the request was for a report to determine what action could be taken by the Commission, with the action to be agendaized at a future meeting. Chair Shriver and Commissioner Cotchett agreed that this was the appropriate way to proceed.

Chair Shriver asked if there were comments on any other matters. There being none, The Chair thanked Asilomar Superintendent Stephanie Price and Asilomar General Manager Patrick Sheridan for hosting the Commission meeting and being so helpful.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Shriver adjourned the meeting at 11:28 a.m.

ATTEST: These minutes were approved by the California State Park and Recreation Commission on February 11, 2005, at its duly-noticed public meeting in San Diego, California.

By: ORIGINAL SIGNED BY Date: 2-11-05

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