

**Chino Hills State Park Road and Trail Management Plan
Initial Study and Negative Declaration
Public Comments and Department Responses**

Commenter	Comment	Department Response
Public	How did the pandemic affect the ability to provide hard copies of the Road and Trail Management Plan (RTMP)?	Hard copies of planning documents and associated environmental analysis are typically made available for public review in public libraries and state park offices. Because these locations were closed due to the pandemic, hard copies were not able to be made available.
City of Yorba Linda	Is it possible to add the Casino Ridge Staging Area (formal parking lot) marker to the maps similar to the Quarter Horse Staging Area marker?	The Casino Ridge Staging Area will be added to the maps.
City of Yorba Linda	Can there be added a narrative for the Casino Ridge Staging Area similar to the Quarter Horse and/or Rim Crest access area?	Thank you for the suggestion. A narrative for the Casino Ridge Staging Area will be added.
Public	Keep TRAIL ACCESS at Hidden Hills and BobCat TRAIL	Currently, there is no public access through Hidden Hills. Should public access be provided, the Bobcat Ridge Trail will be available for connections into the park.
Public	A safe ACCESS TRAIL near RimCrest TRAIL Head. Current ACCESS to Telegraph through Easy St. and Little Canyon is dangerous as multi use trail. Easy St. does not allow for bike use but is the direct connection to Telegraph. Conditions are dangerous depending on the season. Little Canyon is near but promotes high speeds for bikers with blind corners. A switchback type TRAIL near the RimCrest TRAIL Head that connects Southridge to Telegraph would A.	Rimcrest is not a recognized trailhead. The official trailhead is at Quarter Horse Staging Area. From there, multi-use connections to Telegraph Canyon are available through Diemer or Little Canyon trails. The planning process has determined that as park service roads, Little Canyon Trail and Diemer are wide enough to support multi-use. Maintaining safe speeds and following proper trail etiquette are the responsibilities of the user, however, the plan has identified Easy

	<p>Require less grade making it slower and safer for multi-use, B. Switchbacks would slow traffic keeping everyone safer and cause less erosion issues, C. A wider TRAIL will be safer. Currently traffic on Easy Street has to completely stop and step off the TRAIL to pass other users. D. the safety and difficulty of Easy Street and Little Canyon discourages users to explore the park</p>	<p>Street and Little Canyon for reconstruction/reengineering to improve safety and sustainability. The planning process has determined that additional impacts associated with the development of a new trail are not necessary due to the availability of existing routes providing similar access and connections.</p>
<p>Public</p>	<p>Realignment of BobCat loop to A sustainable area of the BobCat Service road</p>	<p>The Bobcat Loop Trail has been identified as causing a “critical” level of erosion due to the steep topography and poor soil quality. Given the trail’s location within the Water Canyon Natural Preserve, the resource impacts created by this unsustainable trail are not permissible. In addition, rerouting this trail would heavily impact additional natural resources in the preserve. Pursuant to the Public Resources Code, the purpose of a natural preserve is to conserve the natural resources therein and activities that significantly impact those resources should be avoided. Therefore, the planning process has determined that to conserve the natural resources in the Water Canyon Natural Preserve, the Bobcat Loop Trail needs to be removed. The Bobcat Ridge Trail will continue to provide access in this area.</p>
<p>Public</p>	<p>Connect lower BobCat loop to CAMINO DE BRYANT to provide TRAIL ACCESS</p>	<p>Due to the sensitivity of the natural resources in Water Canyon Natural Preserve, the Bobcat Loop Trail and connected non-system trails will be removed and no new connections</p>

		provided in this area. (See response above.)
Public	TRAIL ACCESS mid NORTHRIDGE TRAIL to COAL Canyon and Telegraph TRAIL	There are existing opportunities to travel from mid-North Ridge Trail to Telegraph Canyon Trail (e.g. Sycamore Trail, Gilman Trail, McDermont Loop). Currently, there is no direct connection from the park north of the Santa Ana River to Coal Canyon south of the Santa Ana River. We are working with the County of Riverside and others to secure a link that would allow a better connection (see Recommendation SAR-2).
Public	Will the Blue Ridge Fire impact plans or make delays while the area grows back to health?	The Blue Ridge Fire will not impact or delay implementation of the plan.
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	Metropolitan owns and operates the 96-inch inside-diameter Yorba Linda Feeder Pipeline and the 108-inch inside-diameter Lower Feeder Pipeline within Chino Hills State Park. The RTMP fails to identify the Yorba Linda Feeder and Lower Feeder and associated easements that traverse the Park.	The Yorba Linda Feeder and Lower Feeder are shown on the maps. They will be highlighted for better visibility. Due to the number of easements with differing effective dates, a comprehensive listing of easements was not included in the plan.
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	The RTMP describes a proposal to designate Lower Aliso Canyon Trail to Telegraph Canyon Trail as a route of Bautista de Anza through the park and to execute a National Historic Trails agreement with the National Park Service. Metropolitan holds easement rights along both the Lower Aliso Canyon Trail and Telegraph Canyon Trail. Metropolitan requests to be notified as the National Historic Trails agreement process progresses in order to ensure that our easement	Any agreement with the National Park Service (NPS) to designate any trail within Chino Hills State Park as a National Historic Trail would not impact any utility easement. Such agreements with NPS provide for recognition of the historic route for interpretive purposes only and do not affect the construction, operation, or maintenance of the trail nor do they convey any rights or obligations to NPS.

	rights are not impacted by the agreement or designation.	
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	The Maintenance and Recommendations Matrix (Table 8.4 of the RTMP Appendix) states that Blue Mud Canyon 1 is recommended for reconstruction and/or re-engineering. The Table notes that “outslope” is needed and there are easement holder (Metropolitan) considerations. Please clarify the meaning of this statement.	<p>"Outsloping" is the process whereby the outer edge of a trail is sloped downhill, away from the trail at 1.5 – 2 times the linear grade of the slope to maintain natural sheet flow of water across the trail. More information on trail design, construction, and maintenance is available in the State Parks Trails Handbook available on our website at www.parks.ca.gov/handbook.</p> <p>"Easement considerations" refers to the fact that there is an existing easement on this road with the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California that should be reviewed by staff prior to performing maintenance.</p>
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	The Maintenance and Recommendations Matrix (Table 8.4) states that Lower Aliso Canyon is recommended for reconstruction and/or re-engineering, and the Table states that Lower Aliso Canyon 9 is “MWD responsibility/AZ crossing proposed”. Metropolitan has an easement along Lower Aliso Canyon Trail and conducts routine road grading along the trail to access the Lower Feeder Pipeline and appurtenant structures, however Metropolitan is not solely responsible for road/trail maintenance. Additionally, while Metropolitan has proposed an Arizona-crossing within Lower Aliso Canyon to protect pipeline infrastructure, project construction timing is still undetermined as the crossing	The proposal by Metropolitan to provide Arizona crossings along Lower Aliso Canyon is included in the plan so that potential cumulative impacts from projects in the park can be appropriately analyzed pursuant to CEQA. There is no assertion that Metropolitan is solely responsible for road and trail maintenance and there are no timelines associated with the recommendations in the plan, although, priorities are recognized.

	requires regulatory approval from the CDFW, which has not yet been obtained.	
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	Metropolitan requests to be notified in advance if trail reconstruction or re-engineering activities are to occur on trails or roads that are also used by Metropolitan to access and maintain our infrastructure, and to ensure that the Park’s planned road maintenance or construction does not conflict with Metropolitan’s OC RWIP maintenance or construction.	Please provide a map of Metropolitan's easement access roads so that the Department can notify you of actions that may impact Metropolitan infrastructure or access thereto.
Metropolitan Water District of Southern California	In order to avoid potential conflicts with Metropolitan’s facilities and rights-of-way, we require that any design plans for any activity in the area of Metropolitan’s pipelines or facilities be submitted for our review and written approval. Metropolitan will not permit procedures that could subject the pipeline to excessive vehicle, impact or vibratory loads. Any future design plans associated with trail construction or reconstruction should be submitted to the attention of Metropolitan’s Substructures Team. Approval of the project should be contingent on Metropolitan’s approval of design plans for portions of the proposed project that could impact its facilities. Please note that all submitted designs or plans must clearly identify Metropolitan’s facilities and rights-of-way.	The RTMP does not anticipate any impacts to Metropolitan access or infrastructure, however, Metropolitan will be consulted on actions that may do so.
Hills for Everyone	A letter by Inland Empire District Superintendent Kelly Elliott on April 29, 2020, states, “The next draft of the RTMP will re-designate Lilac Spur	Blue Mud Canyon 1 and 2 are still recommended for conversion to Administrative Access only (See recommendation RMR-8). Recently, it

	<p>at Carbon Canyon Road, North Ridge Trail 7 and 8, and Blue Mud Canyon 1 and 2 as administrative access only and closed to public use.” Based on our review of the documents and maps, it appears this reclassification only occurred for Lilac Spur Trail 2. We are inquiring as to whether the North Ridge Trail 7 and 8 and Blue Mud Canyon 1 and 2 were intentionally not changed or mistakenly not changed? Our preference is that those trail segments also be reclassified for administrative access only and closed for public use.</p>	<p>was determined that since North Ridge Trail 7 and 8 are currently used for recreation, the use should not be removed without an evaluation under the Department's Change-in-Use process. In the future, these trail segments may be considered for redesignation as Administrative Access Routes only via the Change-In-Use process outlined on our website (https://parks.ca.gov/?page_id=284621).</p>
<p>Hills for Everyone</p>	<p>The acreage for the Mancha parcel is listed as 29 acres but other records indicate it was 33 acres. Please confirm.</p>	<p>The Land Ownership Record shows that the parcel is 29.53 acres. The RTMP will be updated to show the parcel as 30 acres (rounded up).</p>
<p>Hills for Everyone</p>	<p>On page 20, under the heading “Roads and Trail Designations,” the second column, it may also be helpful to clarify that visitors sometimes misidentify a wildlife trail and use it for recreational purposes as a fourth category under non-system trail types.</p>	<p>Thank you for the suggestion. Typically, wildlife trails do not impact natural resources and therefore, they do not need to be removed. However, once a wildlife trail begins to be used by humans, it can become a liability. Thus, "unsanctioned, user created trails" still applies.</p>
<p>Hills for Everyone</p>	<p>We are concerned with the phrase “All new trails and alterations to existing trails shall follow the Department’s Accessibilities Guidelines and the federal accessibility guidelines for outdoor developed areas” at the bottom of column one on page 29. While supportive of new trails and meeting accessibility guidelines, this feels too broad and sweeping—especially if “new trails” are inherited on newly</p>	<p>The Department’s Accessibilities Guidelines and the federal accessibility guidelines for outdoor developed areas require that an attempt be made to make a trail accessible. If there are good reasons why a trail cannot be made accessible, such as the inability to achieve a minimum width or maximum slope, the reasons are documented and trail design and development continues. All new trail</p>

	<p>acquired lands. Consider adjusting to accommodate situations where existing trails on newly acquired lands may not meet this condition and each trail will be evaluated as added to the Park’s roads and trails inventory.</p>	<p>construction and trail alterations should follow State and federal guidelines to ensure they achieve maximum accessibility, but it is not required that they achieve full accessibility.</p>
<p>Hills for Everyone</p>	<p>We support the removal of every non-historic, non-system trail, but as a reminder the existing access for the lands recently acquired by the Mountains Recreation and Conservation Authority connects through a trail and not a road off Lower Aliso Trail, therefore the agreed upon access could be jeopardized as the statement on page 28 says, “Non-system roads determined to be necessary for legal access will not be removed” (emphasis added). This particular access to the Authority’s lands is defined as a “non-system route.” Yet the statement in the Trail Plan says roads. This should be clarified and/or corrected.</p>	<p>Thank you for bringing this issue to our attention. This sentence will be edited and a recommendation added to ensure that the MCRA can be provided access as necessary.</p>
<p>Hills for Everyone</p>	<p>Parkwide Existing Roads and Trails Map - We are unclear why Bobcat Loop, which has been removed from the system trail list, is labeled on this map (and the map within the Trail Plan, page 7). It is shown on other maps (Plan Recommendations – Santa Ana River and Coal Canyon) as Scully Ridge – Trl 15.</p>	<p>Thank you for bringing this issue to our attention. The Bobcat Loop Trail is missing from some existing trail maps, which will be corrected. As a system trail, it should be shown on the existing trail maps. However, it is slated for removal and will be shown as such on the planning recommendation maps. It was erroneously left off the list of system trails in Section 8.5 and will be added. The Scully Ridge Trail -15 connects to the Bobcat Loop Trail and can be difficult to distinguish on the maps.</p>

<p>Hills for Everyone</p>	<p>On page 15, under the Coal Canyon sub-head, the second sentence appears to be in a different font/size. On page 18, under the heading “3.4 Natural and Cultural Resources,” the second sentence should replace “roll” with “role.” On page 21, under the heading “4.2 Designated Uses,” portions of the last sentence in that column, appears to be in a different font/size.</p>	<p>Thank you for identifying these errors. They will be corrected.</p>
<p>Hills for Everyone</p>	<p>On the Existing Roads and Trails Map (DC and TC Area), near the Quarter Horse Trailhead, the word “Corral” is misspelled (“Coral”). The icon used at this location is missing from the legend and should be added. On the Erosion Severity Map (BC Area), the icon that identifies Horse Camp is in the wrong place. Within this same map, the icons for camping by the Equestrian Staging Area seems to have been reduced in size and are difficult to see. On the Plan Recommendations Map (BC Area), the icons should be moved to the top layer so they aren’t bisected by roads and trails. Additionally, while showing on the map, paved roads are not included in the legend and should be added. On the Plan Recommendations Map (DC and TC Area), the icons should be moved to the top layer so they aren’t bisected by roads and trails.</p>	<p>Thank you for identifying these errors. They will be corrected.</p>
<p>SoCalGas</p>	<p>SoCalGas provided maps and instructions for construction projects occurring in the general area of their high pressure natural gas lines, which run through portions of the park.</p>	<p>The RTMP does not anticipate any impacts to SoCalGas access or infrastructure, however, SoCalGas will be consulted on actions that may do so.</p>