

# **Appendix A**

## **Summaries of Public Workshops**

# CARMEL AREA STATE PARKS GENERAL PLAN AND EIR

## Public Workshop #1/EIR Scoping Meeting – April 18, 2012

### Summary of Comments Received

The following is a summary of written comments received at the public workshop on April 18, 2012 or in the form of mailed comment cards following the workshop. The comments are summarized by park unit and topic, as presented during the public workshop.

#### POINT LOBOS STATE NATURAL RESERVE (PLSNR)

---

##### PROCESS

###### Environmental concerns:

- Keep this property as a Reserve; preserve as is
- Parking for PLSNR is an environmental concern

##### RESOURCES

###### Key resources include:

- Quiet reserve aspects
- Value the Whalers Cove Cabin with cultural exhibits about the Cove
- Protect all viewsheds

##### RECREATION

###### Current uses enjoyed include:

- Easy-access trails

###### Desired future uses include:

- The Natural Reserve should not be changed in order to preserve this unique area and its natural resources; no change in use or net new development
- Parking; parking areas need to be graded or marked, or additional parking developed

###### Avoid future uses such as:

- Avoid commercialism, keep the Reserve wild and natural
- Do not allow a zip line on the Reserve

###### Desired future facilities:

- Parking - Improve and enhance parking near easy-access trails; need parking; provide parking on the east side of Highway 1 for the Reserve, not on the highway; provide safe, off-highway parking for walk-in visitors; provide parking at Hudson House and Rat Hill
- Shuttle - Use a shuttle (could be electric bus) to move people from area to area and between the Reserve and Point Lobos Ranch, or to connect parking to the parks (many comments); conduct a thorough feasibility study and cost analysis on providing shuttle service through the Reserve and eliminating most personal vehicles
- Trails - Plan for a walking trail parallel to the road to the information station; provide off-road walking trails for walk-in visitors from the highway to the Sea Lion Point parking lot, well-marked to encourage visitors to avoid walking along the road; add a walking path next to the road through the park, as right now it is a hazard with cars and pedestrians
- Convert the Hudson House area into an entry point for walk-in visitors and an interpretive center (many comments)

- Plan for safe [pedestrian] crossing from the Reserve to/from Point Lobos Ranch (overpass/underpass/tunnel) (several comments)
- Swap the locations of the Bird Island parking lot and picnic area to improve the view for picnickers
- Provide another information station at the Bird Island picnic area, staffed by docents - this would enhance the visitor experience
- No new structures built in either west or east Point Lobos, except for environmental protection or human safety
- Improve interpretive materials for the Marine Reserve. People in the area don't know it's there

## CARMEL RIVER STATE BEACH (CRSB)

---

### RESOURCES

#### Key resources include:

- Most valued resources are access to uncrowded beach and bay/ocean, scenery, benches
- Value the natural setting of Carmel River State Beach for beach activities
- Beauty of lagoon, beach and surrounding area
- Value recreational resources surrounding the beach
- Value wildlife resources in the lagoon wetlands
- Continue with the restoration of Carmel Lagoon area
- State Parks should take the lead in developing a management plan for the lagoon. This will require common sense and compromise by all agencies who heretofore have pursued individual agendas. The lagoon management plan must include protection of the homeowners bordering the lagoon, preservation of the habitat for endangered species, and development of recreation areas for the citizens of California, including parking, beach facilities, and restrooms. The lagoon management plan must include a bulldozer capability as needed to the South to protect Scenic Drive—must avoid any repeat of devastating northern route of several years ago.
- Develop a management plan for the lagoon as part of their general plan – which will preserve the beach, lagoon, parking lot, homes, road, and bathrooms – human beings are a part of the environmental also
- Balance the needs of plants and animals with the needs of visitors. Priority given to a single species (steelhead) has damaged the park. At least develop a multi-species plan (include humans).
- Carmel River State Beach is underutilized and under protected. This is a valuable resource that is in disrepair. Restrooms are closed and access is impaired. No parking available.

### RECREATION

#### Current uses enjoyed include:

- Bird watching
- Picnicking
- Painting by the lagoon
- Walking on beach; walking and enjoying the uncrowded clean beach and lagoon

#### Desired future uses include:

- Have a docent program like the one at the Reserve with a small center next to the restroom. (several comments)
- Provide walking trail from Carmel State Beach to Point Lobos State Natural Reserve
- Minimal change

- Restoration and rehabilitation of historic structures
- Take school children to lagoon to study and observe birds, various life cycles, etc.
- Kayaking in the lagoon, hiking and viewing
- Restore access to the beach
- Guided walks (charge for these)

**Avoid future uses such as:**

- Do not allow a zip line

**FACILITIES**

**Current facilities:**

- Save/keep the Carmel River State Beach parking lot. (many comments)
- Save/keep the Carmel River State Beach restroom. (many comments)
- Trails
- Parking
- Access to beaches
- Repair stairs to Carmel River Beach for easier accessibility
- Furnish parking near the Bay School with improved (safer) access onto Highway 1
- Install warning systems to alert casual visitors to the extreme surf danger at Monastery Beach
- CRSB is missing access – steps have been destroyed and not repaired

**Desired future facilities:**

- Public restroom (many comments); needs 2 full restrooms
- Additional off-street parking. (many comments)
- Drinking water/drinking fountain. (many comments)
- Access: Need better access; access to the beach from the parking lot for the physically challenged and elderly; seasonal boardwalks (when the river is not flooding) to let people walk along the river at certain times of the year; provide a way to walk from Mission Trail Park across Rio Road and down across the river; provide a gate for walkers from Monastery Beach into Point Lobos State Natural Reserve; better access with another stairway towards south along Scenic Road above lagoon, bench near existing stairway; construct a foot/bike bridge above the sewer pipe to connect the beach area to the Odello field area; develop limited hiking trails for nature walks on the Odello field; open the trails in the wetlands extending to Highway 1.
- Provide viewing platforms on the edge of the lagoon
- Find and implement a permanent solution to the annual problem of potential flooding and rapid flushing of the lagoon. Until a permanent solution can be implemented, construct a weir across the lagoon side-arm of the river to prevent rapid flushing when the beach sandbar is breached. (Note that when the newer part of the lagoon was dug a few years ago it repeatedly filled with ground water until the dam at its mouth was removed.) Once the permanent solution has been implemented, repair the Carmelo Street parking lot
- Provide farming/habitat restoration signage
- Habitat restoration interpretive walkway along Scenic Road
- Need an environmentally-friendly way to keep water in lagoon, rather than an ugly toxic berm. Find engineers that are competent to determine the best way to allow water to flow freely without destroying property. We already pay a huge sum to the state in income and property tax. As we have had to spend thousands of dollars in less than five years, due to flooding; find alternative ways (natural) that will prevent the recurrence.
- Protect Scenic Road from river erosion and the lagoon homes from flooding

- Changing areas
- Clearly delineate parking at Monastery Beach
- No need for visitor centers, paved parking lots, or vendors selling gift shop items

## POINT LOBOS RANCH (PLR)

---

### PROCESS

#### Environmental concerns:

- Concern about impacts of automobile access to Point Lobos Ranch: increased traffic, roadways, and parking lots (several comments)
- Concern about increased fire danger from increased public access (several comments)
- EIR needs to include a detailed archaeological survey of the facilities, as well as evaluation of potentially eligible cultural resources. This should be prepared by qualified individuals with experience in local archaeology and prehistory.
- Address local history, historic resources, and Native American concerns
- Do not allow the beautiful scenery of the Monterey pine forest to be diminished
- Don't allow commercial exploitation (e.g., zip line). It would be obtrusive in the quiet, natural area, and inappropriate

### RESOURCES

#### Key resources include:

- Mountain Lion Preserve at Point Lobos Ranch (several comments)
- The Point Lobos Ranch acquisition was funded by the "Mountain Lion bill" (Prop. 117). Increased use is inconsistent with mountain lion and wildlife habitat; mountain lions have moved back into these areas and play a valuable role as a top predator. Their presence should be encouraged, not thwarted by encouraging more access by the general public.
- Point Lobos Ranch was purchased with funds aimed at preserving wildlife in California. Maintaining open animal habitats is a priority.
- Value natural habitat and ecosystems
- Saving the Gowen cypress is important; pygmy forest
- Intact pine forest
- Marine chaparral
- San Jose Creek watershed is important native plant habitat with excellent riparian resources and peaceful area removed from human impacts.
- Rare plants, animals and Native American burial sites should be honored.
- Cultural resources: Point Lobos Ranch contains one of the largest and most significant and unique archaeological sites on the central coast. There are several other associated sites as well; There is [an] area in the Point Lobos Ranch property that needs to be considered as either an additional cultural preserve or reserve with a focus on California Indian interpretation and preservation of traditional practices (the Hudson Mounds as it is locally known); cultural preserve or reserve designation in an appropriate area.

### RECREATION

#### Current uses enjoyed include:

- Leave the park for hiking, camping, horseback riding, and biking

#### Desired future uses include:

- Should be open to the public, with walking/hiking trails, educational interpretive signs, animal-

proof trash cans, benches, and no zip lines (many comments)

- Trails: Include a hiking trail to the summit of Huckleberry Hill (several comments); include a trail (bicycle/pedestrian) connecting Point Lobos Ranch to Point Lobos State Natural Reserve; provide hiking trails along Hwy. 1 to provide access to Point Lobos State Reserve, provide hiking in the hills; trail access up San Jose Creek through both large parcels of Point Lobos Ranch; connect San Jose Creek area with pygmy forest; trails to connect Huckleberry Hill to San Jose Creek; provide equestrian and hiking trails;; develop hiking and horse trails in the back country; provide a trail up San Jose Creek area, extending dirt road; expand trails eastward; hiking (single-track is fine).
- Passive hiking and wildflower viewing; availability for hiking and interacting
- Bird watching
- Science camp/family camp facility
- Educational and family camping area, near highway
- California Indian cultural events and interpretation
- Keep wild and natural, with only trails and possibly a primitive campground added.
- Provide visitor access for activities such as a day camp and hiking.
- Passive uses

**Avoid future uses such as:**

- Do not allow a zip line. (many comments)
- Do not allow disturbing activities. San Jose Creek is a tranquil area to be preserved.
- Don't destroy Point Lobos Ranch to pave parking lots.
- No parking lots or visitor centers. No vendors selling gifts or recreation.
- Hiking trails on Point Lobos Ranch could cause issues with people wandering into private back yards on the Riley Ranch.

**FACILITIES**

**Desired future facilities:**

- Hiking trails (many comments)
- Old ranch buildings at Point Lobos Ranch could be converted to educational facilities for nature and environmental study by children and others. (several comments)
- Could add a parking lot near Monastery Beach.
- Possible overnight stays in historic buildings unless they are to be used as employee houses.
- Improved hiking access to Point Lobos Ranch
- Outdoor education camp
- Off-highway parking for Point Lobos State Natural Reserve
- Avoid commercialism
- Allow equestrian trails with linkage to Palo Corona (Fish Ranch).
- Provide hiking trail to pygmy forest and beyond.
- Low-impact campground
- Develop a campground limited to tents and small RVs to minimize noise. This would also bring in revenue.
- Provide water and bathrooms
- No trails and no public access in the Point Lobos Ranch property.
- All Indian sites to be respected and preserved, no public access. All areas along the San Jose creek to be preserved and no public access.

**OTHER**

- Make it a goal to acquire the Whisler property in San Jose Creek so that the two large parcels in

San Jose Creek can be connected at least by an easement. It would be better as a single park unit.

- Need to do trail work and maintenance to control invasive plants; vital to control cape ivy in San Jose Creek wildflower fields.
- Add an entrance fee for passive hiking in San Jose Creek watershed.

## HATTON CANYON

---

### PROCESS

#### Environmental concerns:

- Concern about increased fire danger from increased public access (several comments)

### RESOURCES

- Preserve and maintain the delicate ecological uniqueness and diverse habitat of flora and fauna and native Monterey pine forest (many comments)
- Most valued resources are the wildlife corridor, unique and varied flora and fauna, water sources, endangered and migratory species. (many comments)
- Hatton Canyon is another cultural resource area with Native Californians living there into the 20th century.
- Eradicate invasive plant species

### RECREATION

#### Current uses enjoyed include:

- Walking, hiking, bird watching, current passive and low-impact use, quiet, natural beauty, nature study, birds, walking dogs on leashes, no motorized vehicles (many comments)

#### Desired future uses include:

- Extend bike/pedestrian trail from Hatton Canyon trail to Point Lobos State Natural Reserve (many comments)
- Educational interpretive signs of flora and fauna, benches (many comments)
- Create paved bicycle path on Hatton Canyon (several comments)
- Open trail to Carpenter Street with future connection to Regional Park and Jacks Peak Park

### FACILITIES

#### Desired future facilities:

- Animal-proof trash cans, regular supervision, benches, continued fire suppression (many comments)
- Restroom (several comments)
- Provide a paved bike trail through Hatton Canyon to provide a way to travel from Carmel Valley Road to the Carmel High School so that bike riders do not have to travel on dangerous Highway One. Then extend the bike trail all the way north to eventual connect around Highway one and Highway 68; provide a hike and bike trail from Carmel Valley Road to Carpenter as an alternative to riding bikes on Highway 1.
- Enhanced access to hiking/biking trails from local communities, such as those adjacent to Hatton Canyon
- Keep and improve hiking trails.

#### Avoid future facilities such as:

- Do not pave Hatton Canyon as paving would destroy the habitat and fundamentally change the ecological environment. (many comments)

- Eliminate current and special events (Halloween, Christmas trees, etc). It's inconsistent with State Park values and Highway 1 view shed/coastal protection.

#### OTHER

- Identify/rename Hatton Canyon as “The Hatton Canyon Preserve” (many comments)
- The mitigation of plantings at the mouth of Hatton Canyon by TAMC has actually improved the habitat and is well-maintained at this point.
- Hatton Canyon shouldn't be a State Park. Maybe a County park?

#### GENERAL

---

#### PROCESS

##### Environmental concerns:

- Meeting/planning status notices: Provide notices/articles/reports/updates in local publications, including Monterey County Herald, Carmel Pine Cone, KSBW TV, public radio stations, News for Native California, SCA Newsletter and Journal (many comments); include an article in local papers - a feature about the progress; use radio, newspapers, and organizations to reach public; provide press releases with accurate information; advertise for meetings and events on Craigslist; mail updates to residents on the General Plan progress; use interactive media to include people from home (example: broadcast on internet and gather online poll information); contact through email; send out meeting notices earlier.
- Public comments: Send copies of the comment card to local newspapers and TV and ask them to print an announcement so that those not attending can still comment; could have a survey or comment card that could be filled out online, rather than wasting paper, stamps, etc.; reach out through an online survey; KSBW should announce the online survey.
- Cultural resources: Have State Parks hold a face-to-face consultation with all local California tribes to discuss their issues, concerns, and suggestions for what they want to see in the parks; the cultural resources in these parks represent both prehistoric and historic landscapes that are layered. Full consideration of the potential impacts and cumulative impacts need to be addressed in this document; cultural heritage and history of the area; be sure you follow CEQA, especially on Native California heritage sites.
- Accelerate the process so it doesn't take years to get things done.
- EIR should address access by people with dogs
- Address parking and/or public transportation
- Less committees, more decisions
- Docents should have forms (in English and Spanish) to provide to local visitors and to the parents/teachers who visit from “less advantaged” schools in Salinas and other areas. They love Point Lobos and should have a say. Or ask Melissa Gobell [docent coordinator] for list of schools that have brought kids through the PLF program and send forms to participating teachers.

##### Environmental concerns:

- Include specific CEQA guidelines (many comments)
- Erosion from bikes
- Sand erosion mitigation
- Wetland/bird nesting preservation
- Concern about possibility of toxic hazard if a vinyl wall is used in the beautiful, natural ecosystem, including the leaching of the material into the environment as well as the degradation of this material over time due to environmental elements.

- [User] Capacity
- Protecting the areas - rare plants/trees, etc
- Non-concession use of county and State parks
- Wildlife, private property rights, and invasive plants and weeds
- Concern about impact of any development, trails included, on wildlife and endangered species (including bobcats, mountain lions, birds of prey)

## RESOURCES

### Key resources include:

- Natural beauty; natural beauty of the land (many comments)
- Scenic views/view sheds; scenery. (many comments)
- Maintain cultural and natural heritage; non-renewable cultural resources; natural history of all areas - this area is a treasure; the history of the area (many comments).
- Preserve and maintain the delicate ecological uniqueness and genetic diversity habitat of flora and fauna; preserve natural flora and fauna with minimal disturbance; preserve all native habitats; preserve ecological and aesthetic assets; native species biodiversity; unmolested nature, quiet natural scenery; preserving the natural landscapes; healthy, resilient ecosystems (many comments)
- Open space (several comments)
- Quiet; opportunities for reflection and solitude (several comments)
- Rare plant communities, such as marine meadows, cypress groves, and Monterey pine forests
- 40+ species of breeding birds plus migrating species
- Keep the area as wild and pristine as possible; experience of wild nature; wildlife.
- Accessibility; accessibility to special natural wonders – Point Lobos, Soberanes Point, Lime Kiln campsite
- Hiking trails: key resources are walking and hiking trails; access to natural areas via hiking trails.
- Preserve our indigenous/nearly pristine forest of *Pinus radiata* and Bishop Pine, a unique (nearly) habitat that has been so drastically rescued in Monterey and Pebble Beach; the Monterey pine forest and associated habitat
- Clean air, pristine ocean, rocky shore, sandy beach, flora and fauna

## RECREATION

### Current uses enjoyed include:

- Bird watching (many comments)
- Photography (many comments)
- Hiking; hiking, both easy and difficult trails; walking; scenic hiking trails (several comments)
- Access to beaches
- Animal watching
- Cycling
- Beach picnicking
- There are already many places for coastal and inland hiking.
- History

### Desired future uses include:

- Horseback riding (many comments)
- Hiking (many comments)
- Bird watching (several comments)
- Estuary walks. (several comments)

- Biking (several comments)
- Beach walks
- Environmental education focus for existing properties
- Tide pools
- Low-impact recreational uses
- Nothing is missing in outdoor recreational activities that could be added without significant impact on the natural and cultural values that exist in the parks.
- Have naturalists lead hikes so we can learn about nature, animals, insects and plants.
- Kayaking
- Camping with horses
- Hunting
- Fishing
- Continue to allow for historic uses, including ranching/cattle grazing.
- Provide interpretation for the unique cultural sites within and immediately adjacent to State properties.
- Keep present environmental restrictions at Point Lobos State Natural Reserve and Carmel River Beach.
- All four areas are great for walking, hiking, bird and animal watching, wildflowers, general nature study and contemplation.
- Bike or walking paths to discourage cars
- Botanizing
- All Carmel Area State Parks should remain in natural condition. No recreation allowed which requires structures or defacement of natural terrain.
- Passive recreation only
- Picnicking
- Scheduled guided tours – age-specific

**Avoid future uses such as:**

- Do not allow a zip line. (many comments)
- Do not allow mountain bikes.
- Nothing besides walking trails or riding bikes (not on trails).

**FACILITIES**

**Current facilities:**

- Trails (many comments)
- Parking (several comments)
- Available and clean restrooms
- Coastal pathways and beach access

**Desired future facilities:**

- Equine/horse trails (many comments)
- Provide parking for horse trailers at trail heads. (several comments)
- Bike parking racks
- Create parking lot off Highway 1 and charge for parking.
- Keep undeveloped, natural, and accessible with a low impact trail system
- Overnight camping facilities for youth/families/educational purposes
- Connectivity between communities and the open space that surrounds them - Jack's Peak, Mission Trail, State Beach at the Meadows, Palo Corona, Point Lobos, Garland Park, Del Monte

Forest, Hatton Canyon.

- Construct trails in a way that is compatible with sustaining Park ecosystems and biodiversity.
- Contact Fort Ord/Marina Equestrian Center for support in horseback riding.
- Greater hiking opportunities
- Improve safety of the Rio Road to Carmel Highlands corridor by reducing the speed limit to 45 mph on this entire stretch (eliminating the 55 mph section). Unsafe points with frequent close calls include the Ribera Road intersection, access to the Bay School, Monastery Beach, and the entrance to Point Lobos.
- Improve the walk/bike connectivity from the Rio Road area to Point Lobos.
- Horse camping sites
- Limit parking in well-defined areas not near cultural sites.
- Simple parking, trails, and restrooms using as much natural material as possible (no rip-rap). No vinyl flood walls. Use local stone.
- Converting and improving existing buildings should be the goal, not new construction in pristine areas.
- Confine infrastructure to degraded areas, aim for safety along the Highway 1 corridor
- Basic infrastructure for health, safety and access
- Working toilets and hand washing facilities
- Well-maintained and well-graded trails

**Avoid future facilities such as:**

- Don't change a thing – except for parking and a visitor center
- No commercial ventures (beyond guide books, maps)
- Campgrounds should be placed at Fort Ord, not Point Lobos Ranch

**OTHER**

- The cultural education program with the River School is terrific!
- Need to resolve safety issue between equine and bike use
- No parking on Highway 1; extremely dangerous
- Show other preserved properties on maps, such as BSLT or Palo Corona lands.
- At future meetings, it would be helpful to have questions/answers and discussion about each of the areas (limit each person to 5 minutes).
- Keep all California State Beaches open to public as intended by our tax dollars paid through the years.
- Everybody (myself included) in this meeting appeared to be 55 years old and more (much more). What is the interest of youth? It would be interesting to do a similar meeting in Salinas asking residents/taxpayers there what they would like. We need to think of other demographics not only the Carmel crowd.
- In all park areas the issue of invasive plants must be addressed. Fire as a tool for controlling invasive plants should be considered.
- Camp SEA Lab is fully prepared to be involved if called upon (re: possible science camp/family camp).
- Provide parking alternatives for current cars parked at Point Lobos on Highway 1.
- Parking for access to other areas (i.e., Palo Corona)
- Ask the Society for CA Archaeology for comments.
- Ask the State Office of Historic Preservation for comments.
- Concerned about fire hazard related to zip line use
- Make sure everyone and everything is following CEQA standards.

- Engage the local indigenous communities in a formal consultation process to assist in interpretation of cultural sites.
- Enhance guides and maps.
- Even if the park is closed, people will continue to use it as it is a rational alternative to trails located further south in Big Sur for locals.
- Address hazardous fuels in the parks, particularly Point Lobos.
- No to parking, no to tourism, and no to commercialism
- Start lobbying in Sacramento – Make them understand that parks are not revenue producers; they provide enjoyment.
- Do not let parks become privatized.
- Transfer management at the earliest opportunity to Point Lobos Foundation or the Monterey Regional Park District. State Parks has failed in its mission to preserve the area.
- "The Coast to the Village" should be the core theme.
- Volunteer efforts should complement staff [efforts].
- There should be certain areas designated for multi-use (bike, hikes, dogs, and horses, where appropriate).
- A way to enforce "No dog" issues?: Use big signs (and the honor system): "No dogs – Thanks for your cooperation, signed: The Deer, The Rabbits, The Birds, The Lizards!"
- Allow for uses of land such as north of Santa Cruz - Wilder [Ranch] State Park – farm practices.
- Don't let parks die because of misplaced funds.
- Laguna Seca is certainly a success though that is under the regional park system. Certain parks should be designated for certain commercial use – perhaps such as zip line, miniature golf, bungee jumping, etc.
- Traffic safety along Highway 1, parking along Highway 1, illegal U turns and pedestrians crossing Highway 1, garbage left behind along Highway 1, vandalism and auto break-ins along Highway 1- (Monastery Beach to the entrance of Point Lobos and beyond). These issues need to be addressed first or have priority before any expansion is considered.

## Revenue

- User fees: Charge walk-ins at PLSNR (many comments); I would have no complaint with paying a reasonable users fee; charge a use fee at Point Lobos State Natural Reserve. People parking on the highway don't pay.
- For a mile on either side of Point Lobos [Reserve] park entrance make it no parking anytime on the shoulder of Highway 1 and enforce it. Create a paid parking lot on the west side of the highway, just before the park entrance, there is a large house there overlooking Carmel Bay [Hudson House] and can be converted to visitor information center and contracted out for events. There is also trail access to the front entrance of the park. Charge a fee for parking. In addition, all the houses on Point Lobos Ranch can be used as short term [vacation] rentals.
- Allow donations for memorial benches (many comments)
- Fee on private car license renewals (many comments)
- Access to trails at Point Lobos Ranch could be given using a paid permit system – this would generate funds, limit access, and preserve resources. (several comments)
- Sell equestrian day passes or annual passes to use a horseback riding facility.
- Revenue could be helped by having an annual pass program.
- I never mind paying parking and entrance fees because State Parks really needs the money.
- Revenue could come from interpretive opportunities.
- There should be a statewide fee charged to fund the State Parks. A \$10 fee at the DMV would

do it. This would NOT get you free admission. A new proposition should be started.

- Increase taxes or park fees
- Charge for parking (using parking meters)
- Charge for bathroom
- Develop docent programs – create rewards programs that would lead to free passes in other parks
- No further trails or improvements should be done until state funds are available for employee salaries. There are not enough Rangers for the parks.
- The parks shouldn't make money but follow the State Parks mission of providing for human relaxation.
- Revenue should not be allowed to trump cultural preservation and protection responsibilities.
- Like that there are little to no fees
- Provide public and free access



**Carmel Area State Parks  
General Plan and Environmental Impact Report**

**Summary of Public Input  
Public Workshop 2 - Proposed Alternatives  
July 22, 2015**

## Carmel Area State Parks General Plan and Environmental Impact Report Public Workshop 2 – Proposed Alternatives Summary of Public Input

### 1. INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the topics raised by the public during Public Workshop 2 - Proposed Alternatives and the subsequent comment period. This report includes three sections: Introduction, Overall Comment Themes, and Summary of Public Comments.

On July 22, 2015, the California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR) held the second public workshop for the general plan preparation process for the Carmel Area State Parks (CASP). The four CASP park units are:

- Point Lobos State Natural Reserve (PLSNR)
- Carmel River State Beach (CRSB)
- Point Lobos Ranch Property (PLRP)
- Hatton Canyon Property (HCP)

This workshop took place at the Rancho Canada Country Club in Carmel, California. The purposes of the public workshop were:

- Summarize issues, opportunities, and constraints influencing plan alternatives
- Receive public input on the draft alternatives and record public preferences regarding alternative features
- Review and summarize public comments to begin to formulate the Draft Preferred Alternative

This public workshop presented the draft alternatives and engaged participants in an interactive session to learn about and provide feedback on alternative concepts and features, including land conservation, park management, public recreation, and visitor facilities. The workshop provided the public with an opportunity to speak to the planning team, provide written comments, and record their preferences through a variety of modes, described below. Additional comments could be submitted for two weeks following the workshop. Prior to the public workshop an email blast and newsletter were sent to individuals, agencies, and organizations on the project contact list to announce the workshop and encourage public participation.

Workshop announcements were also published in the local newspaper. Information about the alternatives, including the workshop presentation and associated graphic materials, was posted on the CDPR CASP General Plan project webpage for the public to review during the week prior to the workshop, and also following the workshop.

Approximately 150 people attended the public workshop and approximately 200 comment cards and emails were received. Approximately 80 percent of workshop attendees live adjacent to the parks or in residential communities immediately surrounding the parks. Other attendees and commenters include members of various local agencies, groups, organizations, and interested parties residing outside the region.

Two conceptual action alternatives were presented. Following the presentation, attendees broke out into groups to review the alternatives. Each park unit was organized into separate stations with displays where, for the next 80 minutes, participants reviewed the alternatives and asked questions of the planning team. The materials presented at each park unit station included a map of each alternative and image boards with photographs and descriptions depicting the general look and feel of some of the important alternative



features presented. After hearing from several participants that they would like to provide input on the “No Action Alternative” (which would include no update to the current CASP General Plan) large note sheets with a “No Action Alternative” title were posted at each unit station. Because the “No Action Alternative” includes no changes to the existing condition and operation of the unit, no opportunities and constraints associated with this alternative were provided.

Workshop participants were given the opportunity to express comments in several ways. Participants could note a preference for or lack of a preference for each feature choice on the image boards or alternative maps using colored dots (green/yellow dot = prefer; red/blue dot = do not prefer). This preference exercise was designed to provide the planning team with an idea of the public’s preference of each alternative feature and to indicate to participants how other participants feel about particular alternative features. The colored dots were not counted, instead showing graphically the overall preference of one alternative feature over another, or if preference was mixed. Flip charts were provided to record written and verbal comments at each station. Comments were placed directly on maps, image boards, and/or flipcharts.

All of the public input received during the workshop and the subsequent comment period will be considered during development of the draft preferred alternative. Additional opportunities for public review of the preferred alternative will be provided at a future public workshop.

## **2. OVERALL COMMENT THEMES**

Below is a summary of the primary comment themes, categorized into four subject areas: Resource Management; Visitor Experience and Management; Circulation, Parking, and Access; and Operations and Maintenance.

### **RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

Commenters expressed support for the on-going and long-term protection, conservation, and management of the existing natural and cultural resources of each park unit, as well as physical resources, such as geology and water. The cultural resources were highlighted in comments as being locally and regionally significant and threatened by intrusion of incompatible uses and activities. Preserving the setting of the parks and the high-quality nature experience that they offer was a common theme.

#### ***PLSNR***

Concerns about protecting resources at PLSNR are paramount and comments suggested limiting the number of cars and/or visitors, providing guided tours only, and limiting access to certain sensitive areas in the reserve. The phrase “loved to death” was used to communicate concern about soil erosion and vegetation trampling.

#### ***CRSB***

At CRSB, the fragility of the lagoon and surrounding wetland areas where the Carmel River meets Carmel Bay was emphasized. Comments expressed a desire to maintain and enhance the natural qualities of the area.

The relationship of the lagoon with local flooding conditions was noted as a reason to protect hydrological integrity using natural systems at Odello West and throughout the park.

#### ***PLRP***

The creation of natural and cultural preserves at PLRP was supported. Comments supported some trail access, and it was requested that planning trails should be in a manner that protects the special habitats, historic resources, and important sites of the Rumsen people.



### *HCP*

Comments noted that HCP provides important wetland habitat, a wildlife movement corridor, and birding opportunities. Many comments support keeping the property undeveloped as open space.

### **VISITOR EXPERIENCE AND MANAGEMENT**

Comments regarding visitor experience and management were the most varied and divided of all the topical areas. Some comments supported additional visitor-serving development such as limited overnight accommodations and an overnight science camp; other comments were strongly opposed to any additional development. Many comments supported maintaining the park units generally as is with no change. Most comments were in favor of adding hiking trails. Trailheads with limited parking, rest rooms, and trails with interpretive signage were noted as consistent with the scope and scale of visitor access in a sensitive natural and cultural area.

### *PLSNR*

At PLSNR, comments strongly expressed that too many visitors were damaging the reserve and a system to disperse, control, and limit visitors should be implemented. Some comments suggested that the Hudson House could be converted to a visitor-serving use with parking, or that this could be the reserve entrance in lieu of the current park entrance.

### *CRSB*

Some comments opposed new development, while others supported a visitor-serving facility at Odello West if it is designed to be sensitive to the site and located outside the floodplain.

### *PLRP*

Overall, comments focused on resource protection with limited new development. Many comments preferred a limited number of new facilities to accommodate trails, parking, and visitor access. Most commenters felt that an aerial trail was not suitable.

### *HCP*

Comments supported transfer of the park to a local park agency, keeping the event staging and uses at Marathon Flats, and adding a regional cycling trail to connect Carmel Hill to the parks. Comments also supported keeping upper (northern) HCP undeveloped, favoring open space.

### **CIRCULATION, PARKING, AND ACCESS**

Traffic circulation, parking, and vehicle access received the most comments and these topics were raised in relation to many regional and site-specific issues. Parking and congestion along State Route (SR) 1 were of paramount concern. Some comments expressed concern that new development or activity in the parks will exacerbate the excessive traffic on SR 1. For this reason, many comments favored establishing a shuttle system to transport visitors to the parks from lower HCP or other locations in the community. Some comments supported improved bicycle facilities serving the parks. Comments were split regarding maintaining vehicle parking at PLSNR or removal of all parking (except for disabled spaces and diver access). Parking along SR 1 to access PLSNR and beaches was seen in many comments as a major safety concern. Several comments noted other parking concerns, such as opposition to parking lot locations west of SR 1 for various reasons including the size and scope of the parking proposed, the associated traffic that could occur, potential negative impacts to the scenic viewshed, and disruption to natural areas and adjacent residences. Support was expressed for additional parking where it would blend in with surroundings, not be visible from the highway or adjacent communities, and serve to alleviate congestion in other places,



particularly PLSNR. Additional parking areas were supported to provide greater access to areas of the parks that are currently not open to the public, predominantly PLRP.

### ***OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE***

Comments related to protection of public safety, more efficient operations that reduce traffic congestion, limiting visitors or establishing a reservation system, and enforcement of resource protection policies.

Overall maintenance (such as trash removal) and resource management were important to commenters. Commenters expressed that new facilities and uses should only be planned when there is adequate staffing and enforcement. Public safety concerns include beach safety, drownings at Monastery Beach, and coastal trail safety. Other management issues include concern about excessive special events (including weddings), overflowing trash bins, and traffic congestion. Some comments recommended an improved fee collection system. The potential effect of traffic congestion on emergency access and preparedness was also raised by several commenters. Wildland fire risk reduction and preparedness were noted as important, recognizing the large expanses of public lands, fire fuels, and the urban-wildland interface in and near the parks.

## **3. SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS**

This section includes a summary of the results of the preference (colored dot) exercise and a summary of the comment topics received during and after this public workshop,

### ***PREFERENCE EXERCISE RESULTS SUMMARY***

The following is a unit-by-unit discussion of the preference (colored dot) exercise summarizing the workshop participant response to the features presented on the image boards and maps. This preference exercise was designed to provide the planning team with an idea of the preference of each alternative feature and to indicate to participants how other participants feel about particular alternative features. The colored dots graphically demonstrated the overall preference of one alternative feature over another, or whether preference was mixed. Dots were not counted and this was not intended as a voting system. This summary includes general, visual interpretation of the results, and is not an actual colored dot tally.

#### ***Point Lobos State Natural Reserve***

##### **Alternative 1**

PLSNR Alternative 1 received mixed response. Slightly more participants supported maintaining current vehicular access and parking. Participants overwhelmingly supported adding parking in PLRP with a pedestrian tunnel under SR 1. The “no shuttle” option received mixed response, as did keeping the existing parking on coastal bluffs. Many participants responded negatively to the option of retaining Hudson House as staff housing. Participants responded positively to the Forest Reserve management zone, which identified new hiking trails.

##### **Alternative 2**

PLSNR Alternative 2 received a slightly more positive response than Alternative 1. The “with-shuttle-stop” option received mixed response, leaning toward preference of the shuttle. Limited vehicular access and parking also had mixed response, but appeared to lean toward preference. Removing parking from the coastal bluff and restoring these areas also had mixed input, appearing to lean slightly toward preference. The adaptive reuse of the Hudson House for a visitor-serving use was overwhelmingly supported



### ***Carmel River State Beach***

#### **Alternative 1**

Strong opposition was expressed for adding parking near Bay School in the Coastal Margin (Bay School) management zone. Parking within the Odello Farm zone had more mixed response than parking within the Coastal Margin zone (Bay School). “No shuttle” was preferred, but confusion was expressed during the workshop related to a double negative resulting when a red dot was applied to “No shuttle.” Strong preference was expressed regarding minimal visitor facilities in the Odello Farm management zone (restrooms, visitor information, and day use). The group education center received an evenly mixed response. Uses identified in the Lagoon/Wetland management zone (ecological restoration, day use, and special events) received positive response. Kayak staging in the Coastal Margin (Scenic Road) management zone was generally opposed, as were the interpretive stations throughout CRSB. There was preference for keeping CRSB classified as a State Beach.

#### **Alternative 2**

Substantial opposition was expressed toward the visitor center, café, and retail shop. The shuttle stop at Odello Farm management zone showed mixed opinions. Participants primarily opposed parking in the Coastal Margin (Bay School) management zone. The uses identified in the Ohlone Coastal Cultural Preserve were supported. Kayak staging within the Coastal Margin (Scenic Road) management zone was not supported. Substantial support was given to the uses identified in the Lagoon/Wetland management zone (ecological restoration, day use, special events, trail, guided tours, and interpretive signage). Reclassification of CRSB to a State Park and combining this unit with PLRP was mostly opposed.

### ***Point Lobos Ranch Property***

#### **Alternative 1**

All three natural preserve options received overwhelming positive feedback. The 280-space parking lot at PLRP was mostly received well, as well as parking near San Jose Creek. Participants responded negatively to the “no shuttle” option but confusion was expressed during the meeting related to a double negative resulting when a red dot was applied to “No shuttle.” Participants supported day use only with no visitor accommodations, as well as the “no aerial trail” option. The pedestrian tunnel crossing received support.

#### **Alternative 2**

Participants provided positive feedback for the natural preserve. The shuttle and parking received mostly positive feedback and the “no pedestrian tunnel” option received overwhelmingly negative feedback.

Participants clearly supported the pedestrian tunnel. Negative response was provided for all overnight accommodation concepts and the aerial interpretive trail. Opposition was expressed for uses allowed within the A.M. Allan Ranch (North) management zone.

### ***Hatton Canyon Property***

#### **Alternative 1**

The “no shuttle” option received positive and negative response. The option to leave Hatton Canyon unclassified was mixed, leaning slightly to being preferred.

#### **Alternative 2**

The shuttle option was preferred, but not by a large margin. Extending the paved multi-use trail through Upper Hatton Canyon was supported. Support was expressed for hiking, but some opposition was expressed



for interpretive signage along Upper Hatton Canyon. Most participants did not prefer classifying Hatton Canyon as a separate State Park.

### **SUMMARY OF COMMENT TOPICS**

Commenters were given the opportunity to provide comments in a variety of ways during and after the workshop, including submittal of comment cards provided at the workshop, emailing comments, and sending comments via postal service. Topics raised in all of the comments received are summarized below according to: general workshop/outreach comments; overall parkwide concerns; and by each park unit.

Parkwide and unit comments are organized into four topical themes:

- Resource Management
- Visitor Experience and Management
- Circulation, Parking, and Access
- Operations and Maintenance

All comments are coded to indicate the source, as follows:

- CC = Comment Cards during and following the workshop via email and regular mail
- EM = Email comments following workshop
- FC = Flip Chart comments during workshop
- LT = Letters following the workshop via mail

This summary is intended to capture the comment topics that are relevant to planning decisions affecting the general plan or environmental issues pertinent to the EIR. Many topics were raised by multiple commenters and some comments received were not relevant to topics that would affect preparation of the general plan and EIR. The summary does not list repeated individual comments.

### ***General Workshop/Outreach Topics***

- Request to see economic study (FC)
- “Double negative” colored dot ratings are confusing (FC)
- Add acreages to the preserve areas on the maps (CC)
- Poorly organized – no opportunity to ask questions; consultants were not neutral; presenters did not give additional info; if there are three options why were only two options made available (CC)
- I was unable to attend meeting due to lack of public announcements; be more transparent with the plan (CC)
- All types of users should be represented; survey visitors from other states/countries – mainly local residents show up at these meetings (CC)
- Create an online survey for quick feedback and opinions regarding the General Plan; difficult to attend meetings and decipher alternatives; enlist local media to advertise the website and participate in online survey (EM)
- I liked the format that gave everybody at the July 22 workshop the chance to look at the various units' proposals/alternatives, very democratic, and a good chance to exchange ideas with other participants. Many of the proposals appeared to be a good start at solving problems (EM)
- Two weeks is not enough time to assess the material. The documents were poorly organized and difficult to read. The “image boards” were much easier to follow, please consider a simpler approach like this for the next round of public comments (EM)
- Need clearer definitions of classifications and management zones (EM)
- A local residential group should be allowed to work with the staff to revise the proposals and offer other alternatives (EM)



## *Parkwide Topics*

### **Alternatives in General**

- No support for Alternative 1 or 2 – leave areas undeveloped for future generations; prefer Alternative 3 – do nothing (CC, EM)
- Completely opposed to any of the proposed plans (CC, EM)
- Alternative 1 supported but add shuttles (CC)
- In favor of Alternative 2, see the benefit of using the four properties in ways that expand current uses for the next decades.

### **Resource Management (Parkwide)**

- Wildland fire and overall emergency preparedness planning (LT, EM)
- "Everyone has a right to use State Parks, they just don't have a right to use them up"(EM)
- Let's not forget about the "local population experience" and not just the visitor experience; concerned about creating a SoCal "mob" scene. Protect residents' views. More demands on an already scarce water supply (CC, EM)
- Cap the number of people permitted in the parks and use shuttles from Carmel – do not disrupt this sanctuary for people who come and go, consider the people that live here and protect our home (CC) love the wildlife and bird life seen in its natural habitat, untouched by man (CC)
- The parks serve as places to contemplate nature, god and the "great mystery" (CC)
- The proposed development with the consequent influx of campers, tourists, traffic, parking and restaurants will destroy the ambiance of our (International Religious Order of Discalced Carmelites) ancient and traditional life style that is essential, not only for our contemplative community, but for the hundreds of visitors who come here to meditate and pray in the beauty and silence provided by this sacred space (EM)
- Point Lobos area is sacred ground for the native Rumsen people and are adamantly opposed to commercial activity such as a zip line in or around sacred sites (CC)
- Expand areas to have preserve status - focus on protecting wildlife, ecosystems and native sites (CC)
- Supervisor Potter plans to introduce ordinances that would liberalize short-term rentals that are now illegal in the Coastal Zone. This will dramatically increase the traffic problems while cutting down on available housing, and increasing traffic, as workers have to commute to our area. Further there is no water for these additional rentals under the Regional Desalination Plan, and there is no water for the increases uses being considered by the Park Department (EM)
- In every decision, preservation should be the priority – keep alternatives minimal even at the cost of ease of access (EM)
- Provide the resources inventory for review on the General Plan website (EM) Visitor Experience and Management (Parkwide)
- Some disabled people use motorized wheelchairs – please ensure trails can accommodate them; there should be trails that are easy for wheelchairs to access – it is hard for disabled people to push their wheelchairs on uneven surfaces (CC)
- No mountain biking and no horses – their waste litters the trails (CC)
- Please open trails/parks that are closed to the public and provide picnic areas (CC)
- By providing information re parking, camping, and hiking trails on various State Parks and other websites for visitors, won't more visitors by car, cycle, and foot be attracted? (EM)
- Support of increased public access to units, but need to consider safety concerns first. Residences near parks are at risk (EM)
- Campers and hikers harm the environment and fragile ecosystem, more demand would mean more visitors and harm (EM)
- What provisions will be provided for those wishing to hike south from the various facilities envisioned in the plan? What impact can be anticipated – and mitigated – for those of us who live south of the planned parking and camping areas south of the Carmel River Bridge and Pt. Lobos? By facilities we



- mean trails, campsites, toilets, etc. (EM)
- Support for small park atmosphere with lots of new hiking trails and maybe even some biking trails with interpretive stations and signage (EM)
- Do not turn control of the parks to concessionaires who would limit access and charge to enter the reserves/parks (CC)
- Like to area to remain as close to the way it is now with no further development (CC)
- We do not need a visitor center, campground or other development that will change the pastoral setting of the area (CC)
- Camp Sea Lab has been an incredible experience for many children; we'd like to see them get space to grow this program and give this gift to more people (CC, EM)
- Expand educational opportunities to teach people the importance of the park resources (CC)
- Place the visitor center, coffee shop, and parking lot at Carmel Crossroads, or on the large empty lot on Highway 1 (EM).
- Proposed developments on all units, will simply transfer congestion from one venue to another and only encourage more congestion as time goes on (EM).

### Circulation, Parking, and Access (Parkwide)

- How thoroughly and how effectively will shuttle buses mitigate these issues, unless not using the shuttles will be strictly enforced? How thoroughly can that enforcement take place? What penalties will there be? (EM)
- The shuttle may become a barrier to entry for low income visitors. Would the shuttles be free? Would they run frequently? Shuttles will also become a barrier to foreigners, many traveling the whole State (EM)
- Instead of the shuttle, work with MST on their routes and service levels (EM)
- Use electric vehicles to bring people to the parks, develop "clean and classy" alternatives that do not destroy the area and cater to individuals that want to park their own cars and RV's (CC)
- Shield parking from adjacent resident views – get CalPoly to design (EM)
- Even with the installation of parking lots, will cars still be permitted to park adjacent to the highway? If not, how will that be enforced? Will the enforcement create back-ups? (EM)
- Fix the parking problem on Hwy 1 by posting no parking signs. Solving the traffic situation on Highway 1 should be a top priority (EM)
- Reduce speed limit on area roads from 55 to 35 and add a stop light at Ribera Road (CC)
- Too much traffic on Hwy 1 back and forth to Big Sur; strongly urge no change to the areas along Highway 1 south of Rio Road in the Carmel Highlands. The road cannot and should not be widened - no room for more traffic (CC, EM)
- Traffic is already a daily problem from Carpenter Road to Carmel Meadows (CC)
- Residents are trapped during times of heavy traffic impeding access not being able to get to town for events and for eating out, but also feel threatened by the lack of access to emergency facilities, which is needed during illness or disasters such as fires or flooding. Highway 1 is our only road in and out. There is no alternative. We feel that any further development of the State Parks areas would create impossible to bear traffic stalls. This would create a threat to our safety and quality of life (EM)
- Work with Caltrans to address parking and traffic issues (CC, EM)
- How will traffic back-ups for cars waiting to get into and out of the designated parking areas be handled? Since tie-ups now occur at the entrance to exit from Pt. Lobos, will moving those back-ups to other sites along Hwy. 1 actually be an improvement or make matters worse? (EM)
- Once the lots are full along with any permitted roadside traffic, will all remaining traffic have convenient and safe turn-around sites to reverse course? Or will such reversals have to be made without designated areas, thus creating new traffic and safety hazards? (EM)
- Add dedicated bike lanes from roads to PLSNR and PLRP (CC)
- Better bicycle lanes and markings on all of Highway 1 (EM)
- What is needed is not a park on the east side with trails, but a road that is not a divided highway but a three lane highway, brush removed, a good bicycle path and out of sight parking or bus service (EM)



- Make a safe pedestrian connection to Rancho Palo Corona and more parking please (CC) Operations and Maintenance (Parkwide)
- Need to consider how expensive maintenance of new structures would be in the long run (EM)
- Make temporary ban on smoking, enacted in 2014, permanent (EM)
- Support for using existing structures for staff housing (EM)

### ***Point Lobos State Natural Reserve***

#### **Resource Management (PLSNR)**

- More management zones for habitat protection (FC)
- All areas should be Preserve and should protect wildlife (FC)
- In favor of Alternative 2 for PLSNR (EM)
- Support Alternative 1 and oppose the shuttle; it is the best plan for future use of the property (EM)
- Both alternative add to the number of visitors (FC)
- Need to address carrying capacity and a clear plan for limiting visitation (FC)
- Determine best practices for taking pressure off of the natural resources (FC)
- Reduce erosion (FC)
- The reserve is being loved to death, trail use is everywhere, wildlife is being disrupted, soils and vegetation are being trampled and whole areas are eroding into the ocean (CC)
- Keep the reserve wild and natural, avoid commercialism of the land (EM) Visitor Experience and Management (PLSNR)
- Provide trail access between the Reserve and Monastery Beach (FC)
- Use Hudson House for visitor center/interpretive center/special events with parking – move entry station here as well. Use part of the Hudson House for a visitor center, move the main entrance closer. (FC, EM)
- Provide more boardwalks (FC)
- Count visitors coming in and cap the number based on actual people and not cars (LT) Circulation, Parking, and Access (PLSNR)
- Parking cannot be limited until parking issues on Highway 1 are addressed (FC)
- Meet with Caltrans (FC)
- No need to remove coastal bluff parking, but it may be acceptable if shuttles are provided (EM)
- Support for parking across the highway with a tunnel (EM)
- Eliminate personal vehicle access at PLSNR, with appropriate exceptions (EM)
- Maintain current parking in PLSNR (could close a couple smaller west bluff lots) (EM)
- Remove parking from Highway 1, huge safety concern (FC, EM)
- Remove parking on Highway 1 on east shoulder only; driving into PLSNR should still be permitted (EM)
- Determine the max parking usage level that does not overwhelm the ecosystem (study shows 380 cars, planning lists 500-700 spaces) (EM)
- More ADA restrooms and parking (FC); Support for shuttle system to PLSNR to remove cars. Shuttles should be quiet, clean, electric shuttles (CC, EM)
- Repair steps to China Cove to restore coastal access missing for 5 years (CC) Operations and Maintenance (PLSNR)
- Provide fencing at cliffs to prevent falls (FC)
- Charge walk-in visitors, or a fee for each individual entering. Could also have annual passes available (CC, EM)
- Consider a reservation-based system with visitors signing up for guided tours to protect resources and cap number of visitors (CC, EM)
- Will visitors to Pt. Lobos be required to use the planned tunnel under Rt. 1? How thoroughly can that enforcement take place? What penalties will there be? Realistically, won't added unprotected crossings of Rt. 1 take place? (EM)
- Given that there is almost certainly some fixed number of visitors than can responsibly be permitted



into Pt. Lobos at any point (to protect and not over-tax or endanger its natural resources), how will that be enforced? (EM)

- Limit access to specific times (FC)
- Close at sunset, ½ hour after, or 7pm (FC, EM)
- Implement demand-based pricing, or some sort of pricing scheme for parking (FC, EM)
- Walk-in fee (FC)

### ***Carmel River State Beach***

#### **Resource Management (CRSB)**

- Keep Odello Field as part of CRSB (EM)
- Oppose combining this unit with Point Lobos Ranch (EM) – different landscapes and needs (CC)(FC)
- Support Alternative 1, but with reduced parking (EM)
- Recognize the Rumsen people and the Ohlone Coastal Preserve (FC)
- Advocate for the rare, sensitive and fragile Carmel River Lagoon and Estuary at Odello West; Pacific Flyway for numerous avian species and year-round habitat for mammals and aquatic species, including extensive breeding activity – keep development away from this important area(CC)
- Flooding is an issue and should be considered in the design of facilities at Odello West (CC, EM)
- Be more proactive about restoring the vegetation and soil/dunes on the steep slope between Scenic Road and Carmel Bay. Add additional barriers to prevent damaging foot traffic on this slope (EM)
- Be conscious of littering and the effects from the fires on the beach (EM) Visitor Experience and Management (CRSB)
- No café (FC)
- No structures (FC)
- No new facilities west of Highway 1 (FC)
- No concessions at Odello (FC, EM)
- Include visitor center/science camp at PLSNR (FC, EM)
- Support the development of limited visitor facilities at Odello Field, including restrooms, interpretive panels, picnic tables, trash/recycling receptacles, boardwalks along and into the lagoon (for nature-related activities) (EM)
- Remove the cross (FC)
- Keep the cross (FC)
- Encourage plein air painting zones (FC)
- Allow public access for birding (FC)
- Opposed to kayaking concession as parking and access is already limited (EM) Circulation, Parking, and Access (CRSB)
- No parking at Odello (FC)
- Parking at Odello West and Bay School will increase vagrants and homeless communities and drug trafficking (EM)
- Parking at Odello Farm with a trail to Carmel River State Park coastal trail(EM)
- Support parking at Odello if it is shielded from view from nearby residences. Limit parking at Odello to 20 cars, or less than 70 vehicles (FC,EM)
- Do not put parking on the west side of Highway 1, may be open to putting the parking and supported facilities for current trail usage on the east side of
- All large parking lots should be located at Rio Road with a shuttle stop(FC)
- Support limiting parking at Bay School if there is safe/entry to/from Highway 1. Limited to less than 30 vehicles (EM)
- Support repairing the Carmelo Ave. beach parking lot and re-stabilizing the restroom at that location (EM)
- Parking lots at CRSB should not be neglected, this facility is meant to helpwith access (EM)
- More parking for CRSB (CC)
- Metered parking at Monastery Beach is good (CC)



- Maintain parking access to Monastery Beach for diving (FC)
- Charge for parking. Free after 5pm (FC, EM)
- Close beach parking and access close to sunset (FC)
- No shuttle system and no parking (EM)
- Shuttle should serve other local parks (FC)
- Shuttle stops only at Odello and other “units” (FC)
- No shuttle service to other units from CRSB/Odello (EM)
- No shuttle parking at Carmel Valley Road (FC)
- Need proper traffic planning, including for Monastery Beach (FC)
- Add traffic control measures (FC)
- People use Ribera Road as access to “freeway” driving; speeding (CC)
- Ribera Road at Highway 1 is very bad – new development will only add to traffic problems; no support for any development at Odello West due to extensive traffic and related safety issues (CC)
- Carmel Meadows has enough traffic to deal with now (CC)
- Support building a foot/bike bridge connecting the Odello Field with the beach area. A similar bridge over the river to the area behind the mission would also provide safe walking/biking access from Carmel to the other units (EM)
- Is kayaking safe at CRSB? (FC)
- Include bike trail from Crossroads shopping center to PLSNR (FC)
- Upgrade trail at Carmel Meadows for ADA access (FC)
- Include fences at Monastery Beach to direct visitors to danger signs (FC) Operations and Maintenance (CRSB)
- Restrooms are a mess at CRSB (CC)
- Add lifeguards into budget to prevent drowning. Install effective warning systems to alert visitors of the surf danger at Monastery Beach. There are too many death at this beach (CC, EM)
- Access hours - ½ hour after sunset (EM)

### *Point Lobos Ranch Property*

#### **Resource Management (PLRP)**

- Should be classified as a State Reserve in its entirety (EM)
- Fund inholding acquisition on Lobos Ridge (FC)
- Keep all areas wild and open space. Needs more protection and preservation of ecosystem, wildlife, endangered species, along with the numerous Native American sites (FC, EM)
- Preserve A should be open for general use, not just guided hikes (EM)
- A.M. Allan North, support Alternative 1 parking lot at barn for access to PLRP, not as overflow or shuttle parking for PLSNR (EM)
- A.M Allan South, smaller parking for access to Preserve A area and some potential for removing parking from east side of Highway 1 (EM)
- Expand cultural preserve to include triangle on PLRP (FC)
- Include all of A.M. Allan Ranch in a Preserve (FC)
- Support the three-preserve alternative (EM)
- Prefer the No Action Alternative (FC)
- Tend to support Alternative 1. Natural Preserve B should extend southward of San Jose Creek road to encompass the rich wildflower fields (EM)
- Alternative 1 for PLRP looks good including Natural Preserves – focus on resource protection (CC)
- San Jose Creek is not a good location for camping in or near the creek corridor or anywhere at the ranch to avoid fire danger (CC)
- Need to consider various types of management plans to prevent catastrophic events like fire (EM)
- Trail and parking at San Jose Creek should be well-defined to reduce resource damage and erosion in the creek corridor – protect steelhead and red-legged frog habitat (CC)



- Facilities proposed are not in line with Prop 117 money. Development would severely impact the mountain lion and wildlife habitat (EM)
- Need to use funds intended for mountain lion preservation for the intended purpose (FC) Visitor Experience and Management (PLRP)
- Connect Point Lobos with Garrapata [State Park] and the Backcountry (FC)
- Provide access trail along San Jose Creek to Backcountry East (FC)
- Careful consideration of naming PLRP. Consider other names for PLRP besides A.M. Allen, such as Gowan cypress, etc. (FC) Support the adoption of “A.M. Allan Ranch” as the name of this unit (EM)
- No aerial trail (zip line) - why not electric shuttle to the top so people can see the stunning area around us, drink it in, take pictures, look closely at the vegetation and ride back down to the parking lot? (FC, EM)
- Use the term “zip line” instead of “aerial trail” (FC)
- A zip line, hidden from the road would be great (EM)
- Best use of PLRP is single-track hiking trails (FC)
- Support development for nature-related day use, such as hiking (EM)
- PLRP trailhead needs connecting trails to other properties (FC)
- If horses are allowed, prevent animal waste on trails (FC)
- Concerns related to sharing trails with equestrians—perhaps separate trails (FC)
- There should be equestrian trail options. Provide horseback access through ranch to the beach (CC, EM)
- Allow dogs on leash (FC)
- Non-guided walks are preferred (FC)
- Do not support commercial uses at A.M. Allan North (EM)
- Develop a visitor center and concessions at PLRP where the primary focus is interpretation of natural, cultural, and historic resources of the four components of the park (EM)
- A small visitor’s center would be appropriate (EM)
- Structures should be located at PLRP, not at Odello (FC)
- No structures should be within Highway 1 viewshed (FC)
- No housing rentals (FC)
- Support continued use of staff housing on this unit and preserve existing houses (EM)
- Continue to use the dairy and hay barns for use by the Trail and Maintenance department (EM)
- No overnight visitor accommodations—difficult to police and adversely effects carrying capacity (FC)
- Overnight camping should be very limited and only if supervised due to the potential threats to wildlife and fire hazard risk (EM)
- No shuttles, overnight accommodations or mountain bikes (CC, EM)
- Include science camp for youth education. Science camp can be profitable – economic study is not credible. It could also be managed as part of a larger educational facility (FC, EM)
- Science camp could have cabins for participants, as well as housing for parks employees (EM)
- Support for Camp Sea Lab facility at PLRP, with considerations to affordability for participants (CC, EM)

### Circulation, Parking, and Access (PLRP)

- Support for parking with underground tunnel to PLSNR, rest rooms and interpretive/educational exhibits nestled off Hwy 1 at PLRP where you can describe and not destroy Carmel River Lagoon system and reduce traffic issues at entry to PLSNR. Support removing parking on the east side of Highway 1 (CC, EM)
- Allow only minimal parking at San Jose Creek area (CC)
- No parking access via Riley Ranch Road – also limit parking on Highway 1 within a fixed distance of Riley Ranch Road for visibility and safety at this intersection. Also no parking at San Jose Creek (EM)
- Parking for visitors is needed to avoid dangerous parking on Highway 1. Parking, with a toll booth, on the west side of the highway on both sides of the driveway to Admiral Hudson’s house (EM)
- Support for proposed parking across from the Reserve, but with a toll booth (EM)
- Consider shuttle parking at Fort Ord to alleviate congestion, or reduce the lot of 280 spots and locate



- it at the very southern end of the Ranch (FC, EM)
- Parking for PLSNR and shuttle stop should be located directly across from PLSNR entrance (FC)
- Emergency services are impacted by park-related traffic issues (FC)
- Road infrastructure needs improvement before more traffic can be added (FC)
- Need a traffic study to design better roadways and to see the feasibility of the tunnel (FC, EM)
- ADA compliance is needed (FC)
- Pedestrian tunnel should be a high priority (FC, EM)
- Need trail linkage and trails along the San Jose Creek between Preserves B and C, coordinate with regional parks (EM)
- Trails should be developed for visitors on foot or horseback, no mountain biking (EM) Operations and Maintenance (PLRP)
- Close park around sunset. And close park one day per week (FC)
- Add a bathroom facility at San Jose Creek if a new use is located there (FC)
- Consider the religious use of the properties immediately adjacent to the proposed work on the Ranch (EM)
- Access hours - ½ hour after sunset (EM)

### ***Hatton Canyon Property***

#### **Alternatives in General**

- Prefer Alternative 1 over Alternative 2 (EM) Resource Management (HCP)
- Keep Hatton Canyon as it currently is (EM)
- Keep HCP unclassified and transfer to regional parks as soon as possible so trail connection can be made to points south (CC, EM)
- Be mindful that this is an important natural wetland riparian habitat and accommodates many bird species and invertebrate species (EM)

#### **Circulation, Parking, and Access (HCP)**

- Include bicycle facilities. Upper HCP is a vital bike connection for a regional bike trail (FC)
- Be more specific in locating shuttle parking (i.e. use “Marathon Flats, rather than “Hatton Canyon”) (FC)
- More parking at Marathon Flat area (FC)
- Parking lot would impact Big Sur Marathon—one week each April should be set aside (FC)
- Create parking lot next to Starbucks (FC)
- Add as much parking as possible at and near Hatton Canyon – it blends in with existing parking at the Crossroads center (CC)
- Improve access to the Crossroads shopping area near Safeway from the trail south of Rio Road (EM)
- Very limited parking north of Rio Road for access to park, not for shuttle system (EM)
- Traffic on Highway 1 north and south of the Rio Road intersection is already badly congested at many times of the day; adding parking would exacerbate the situation (EM)
- Maintain options for interconnected trail systems in upper HCP (FC)
- Connect trail to Jack’s Peak (FC)
- A regional bike trail was part of the original settlement of the HCP and has been delayed by the objection of a few residences; Carmel Hill is a huge gap in the regional bike trail system and could eliminate dozens or hundreds of car trips to the parks as well as benefit cyclists (CC)
- Facilities should be ADA accessible (FC)
- Keep current dirt path, build boardwalk in areas, but do not pave (EM)
- Use decomposed granite rather than asphalt or cement to not interfere with natural run off (EM)
- Support extending the unpaved trail to the top of Hatton Canyon for foot and bike access to Carpenter Street, with provision to block motorcycles (EM)



### Operations and Maintenance (HCP)

- Access hours: dawn to dusk – great for birding (EM)
- Management should consider fire prevention and trash control (EM)
- Classify as a separate State Park and seek a managing partner such as Regional Parks (EM)





# CARMEL AREA STATE PARKS GENERAL PLAN AND EIR

## Preferred Alternative Public Open House Summary of Open House Comments

**Date:** June 1, 2016  
**Time:** 6:00 – 9:00pm  
**Location:** Wedgewood Wedding & Banquet Center  
 Rancho Cañada Golf Club  
 4860 Carmel Valley Road  
 Carmel, CA 93923

### Open House Purpose

- Present a summary of the preferred alternative
- Offer the opportunity to learn about preferred alternative details at information stations
- Provide a public comment period before, during, and after the open house

### Planning Team Attendees:

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

## Summary of Open House Comments

California State Parks (CSP) has summarized below the public input about the preferred alternative that was received during the June 1, 2016 Public Open House and the comment period beginning before and extending three weeks after the open house. All input has been reviewed and key points are summarized below. The public comments are being reviewed and evaluated for input to the preparation of the Carmel Area State Parks (CASP) Preliminary General Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report (Preliminary GP/Draft EIR), which will be released for a public review and comment period in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and CEQA Guidelines.

### Overview and Summary of Open House Agenda

On June 1, 2016, CSP conducted a public open house for the purpose of presenting the Preferred Alternative proposed for the CASP GP, which was formulated from prior analysis and public input. This was the third public meeting held during the general plan process. The general plan is being prepared for four CASP units/properties, which are:

- ▲ Point Lobos State Natural Reserve
- ▲ Carmel River State Beach (proposed to be combined with Point Lobos Ranch property as a new state park unit, to be named at a later date)

- ▲ Point Lobos Ranch Property (proposed to be combined with Carmel River State Beach as a new state park unit, to be named at a later date)
- ▲ Hatton Canyon Property (to remain an unclassified unit)

Two weeks prior to the public open house, all meeting materials related to the preferred alternative, including technical reports addressing economics and traffic/parking, were posted to the CASP GP public website ([www.parks.ca.gov/caspgp](http://www.parks.ca.gov/caspgp)). Written comments were encouraged and accepted via email, postal mail, or in person before, during and for three weeks following the open house (until June 25, 2016). An announcement and newsletter were distributed to the project contact list in advance of the open house to communicate details about the session and invite participation. A news release announcing the meeting was sent to the local *Monterey Herald* and *Carmel Pine Cone* newspapers. The noticed format for the public open house consisted of a brief presentation providing an overview of the preferred alternative, a lengthy time period for participants to visit information stations to learn more about the details of the preferred alternative, and the opportunity to provide written input on comment sheets.

The preferred alternative, which was developed based on previous planning and analysis efforts and prior public input, was presented to the attendees. Following the presentation, the planning team opened the floor for oral public comments in response to the number of participants requesting an oral comment period. Following the presentation and oral comment session, participants had the opportunity to continue discussion about each of the units by visiting four stations staffed by planning team members. The stations included two large maps of the preferred alternative for each of the four units. Handouts, which included management zone summaries and maps for the Reserve and the combined new state park unit, were provided to participants upon arrival.

Approximately 260 people attended the public open house. The following summary is based on the planning team's understanding of oral comments heard during the open house and a thorough review of written comments. Input received from the public during the open house and the comment period is being evaluated and fully considered in the development of the Preliminary GP/Draft EIR. The public will have additional opportunity to review and comment on the Preliminary GP/Draft EIR during a 45-day public review and comment period. In addition, there will be a public information session scheduled during the CEQA public review period.

### **Open House Welcome and Introduction**

Mat Fuzie, Monterey District Superintendent, opened the meeting by welcoming all participants. He also summarized key elements of the preferred alternative, as well as the components from the previous action alternatives that are not included in the preferred alternative. Items no longer being considered in the preferred alternative primarily include the aerial trail, overnight accommodations (new cabins, family campsites), visitor centers, retail/café uses, and substantially expanded parking. He also reiterated that the Hatton Canyon Property would not be transferred back to Caltrans, but that CSP is exploring a transfer to one or more appropriate local or regional agencies.

### **Preferred Alternative Presentation**

Curtis Alling, Ascent Environmental, provided an overview of the open house agenda, a summary of the previous public workshop on the concept alternatives held in July 2015, and an overview of how the preferred alternative was crafted in response to public comment and now has a stronger focus on conservation, restoration, and protection of natural resources and protection of cultural resources.

Donna Plunkett, practiceNATURE, described the preferred alternative management zones, including the proposed uses, facilities, and resource management actions for each of the CASP units. She also spoke about the new unit classification including consolidating the current Carmel River State Beach, Point Lobos Ranch Property, and inland portion of the Reserve (east of State Route [SR] 1) into a combined state park unit. The current Reserve property west of SR 1 will remain as a State Natural Reserve. Hatton Canyon Property is proposed to be managed in its current condition without any facility, use, or classification changes with a goal to transfer this property to another local or regional agency.

Donna highlighted where many existing visitor uses and access points would remain and also where changes would take place, including opening of the inland area of the proposed New State Park to the public. She also noted that limited access would be provided at the Odello Farm area of the proposed New State Park's coastal area (CRSB) to allow environmentally sensitive, well-designed access near the historic farm complex. She noted that the focus on conservation is evident with the extensive natural and cultural preserves proposed, which is one of the most resource-protective sub-classifications within a state park unit. Donna spoke about the various transportation and access options and highlighted where new parking may be built if deemed necessary in the future. She emphasized that the General Plan is intended to provide guidance for approximately 30 years and not all elements shown in the plan may ultimately be implemented, pending additional detailed project-specific consideration and funding.

### **Oral Comment Session**

At the request of the attendees, the planning team opened the floor to hear oral comments from the participants. The comments generally opposed proposed changes to the park units. Comment topics included concerns about a perception that Hatton Canyon would be returned to Caltrans, exacerbation of existing traffic congestion, development at the parks that may attract more visitation, visitor uses in the Odello Farm management zone, parking along SR 1, and any new parking areas proposed. A detailed record of the oral comments was not taken; however, all oral comment topics were raised in the written comments received.

### **Information Station Session**

Following the presentation and oral comment period, planning team members were available at four stations displaying maps of the preferred alternative for the units. The New State Park was divided into two stations—coastal area (current CRSB) and inland area (current Point Lobos Ranch property). Attendees visited unit stations to learn more about the preferred alternative details and continue asking questions. Participants were encouraged to write down their comments and submit them in the comment box provided. Approximately two hours were allotted for the information station session.

#	Key Points Summarized from Public Input
1	<b>Summary of Public Input</b>
2	<p data-bbox="240 264 1468 331">A summary of the key themes and topics is provided based on a thorough review of all written and oral comments. This summary is not intended to be an exhaustive listing of all issues raised.</p> <p data-bbox="240 363 1422 430">The key comment topics related to the following items <i>(not listed in order of comment frequency or importance)</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="289 464 1511 810"> <p>▲ <b>Traffic Congestion</b> – Commenters raised traffic congestion as a major concern for the area and especially for SR 1 around the park units. People expressed that any development of the units in this area has the potential to further exacerbate the already serious traffic congestion on SR 1. The addition of off-highway parking and the prospect that more visitors may use the parks are perceived to create more traffic congestion, particularly affecting nearby residents. It was recommended that shuttle or transit plans be coordinated with the local transportation agencies prior to the preparation of the CASP General Plan to reduce traffic congestion. If parking for the Reserve is developed east of SR 1, many commenters felt that an underground connection beneath SR 1 between the inland area of the New State Park and the Reserve would improve traffic congestion and provide safe pedestrian and vehicle access.</p> </li> <li data-bbox="289 842 1528 1549"> <p>▲ <b>Parking</b> – Many commenters were not in favor of any additional off-highway parking because of the perception that it would add to traffic congestion and bring more visitors to the area. Concerns were also raised about the effects of new parking areas and visitation on ecology and sensitive habitats, particularly in the Odello Farm management zone. Some commenters felt that a small amount of parking near the Bay School would be useful. Some commenters also supported parking in the inland area of the proposed New State Park to replace existing parking in the Reserve. Other commenters were not in favor of removing parking from the Reserve, but instead suggested creating a reservation system for parking spaces in the Reserve. Many local residents visit the Reserve on a regular basis and wish to retain the ability to drive and park within the Reserve. Some commenters expressed that the Hudson House could be a suitable location for limited parking serving the Reserve, because it would be on the same side of the highway as the Reserve and could be screened from view. Many commenters urged the removal of parking along SR 1 and that it should not require serious accidents or fatalities for Caltrans to mandate removal of highway parking. Some commenters expressed support for the Board of Supervisors to seek closure of SR 1 parking and for charging a walk-in fee at the Reserve. Commenters generally supported charging for off-highway parking, assuming free parking can be removed from SR 1. Other commenters suggested replacing the parking at the CRSB parking lot adjacent to Scenic Road that was eliminated by flooding and also considering adding parking at Rio Road. Some commenters expressed support for distant parking lots to serve these parks with a shuttle service to reduce local congestion, such as from Fort Ord Dunes State Park (which is approximately 15 miles north of the Reserve).</p> </li> <li data-bbox="289 1581 1520 1791"> <p>▲ <b>CSP Funding and Staff Capacity to Manage Existing Units</b> – Several commenters expressed that there is a current lack of funding and staffing to manage the parks as they are today and felt that adding more facilities with the potential to bring more visitors would further exacerbate park operations. Commenters asked that CSP focus on better management of the existing parks. Safety, trash, resource degradation, and maintenance backlogs were all cited as current issues that are not being adequately resolved.</p> </li> <li data-bbox="289 1822 1511 1883"> <p>▲ <b>Ecological Protection and Restoration</b> – Some commenters noted the importance of the park units as habitat and natural areas and felt that new development, such as parking and visitor facilities,</p> </li> </ul>

#	Key Points Summarized from Public Input
	<p>would have negative effects on the ecology and sensitive habitats, with many comments focused on the Odello Farm management zone and surrounding Odello West area (Lagoon/Wetland management zone). The importance of Odello West as a wetland area and as bird habitat was emphasized by several commenters. Commenters noted that the parks should remain as natural as possible, preserved as is, and/or restored where damage has already occurred. Some commenters felt that a balance could be reached to allow for visitor access, if environmentally sensitive, well-designed facilities were planned and parking areas were minimized. However, other commenters worried that further development in the area would be a waste of money, due to the potential for sea level rise flooding and the river being reconnected with the floodplain. Concern was also expressed about adverse effects of off-leash dogs. There was support for further natural resource protection of the Odello West area as an important birding area, including a suggestion to support a designation as a National Estuary with other partner agencies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▲ <b>Hatton Canyon Transfer</b> – Most comments about the potential to transfer ownership and management to another agency were received from residents living near the Hatton Canyon Property. These residents supported leaving the property ownership and use unchanged. Commenters cited the legal documents related to the original transfer from Caltrans to CSP and noted a clause that they believed required the land to revert to Caltrans. Some commenters expressed support for transferring the property to the local wastewater district for limited maintenance access and leaving it as open space with no new recreational activity.</li> <li>▲ <b>Trash and Waste</b> – Some commenters raised the topic of trash along the roadways near the park units and trash and waste within the park units, including human waste. Commenters requested more restrooms and stressed the importance of park operations being able to adequately manage people and maintain the grounds.</li> <li>▲ <b>Questions about the Traffic and Parking Study</b> – Commenters who reviewed the Traffic and Parking Study provided on the CSP website questioned different aspects of the study, including the time of day and dates that data were collected and the scope of the study. It was recommended that the study focus on developing solutions to address the severe existing traffic congestion and other limitations that may affect the General Plan.</li> <li>▲ <b>Access Limitation/Permits/Reservation System</b> – Many commenters agreed with the preferred alternative’s goal to limit access to the Reserve, and suggested controlling visitation to other units, as well. There were suggestions for a parking permit and reservation system to the Reserve. A reservation system was mentioned as a way to manage visitation for conservation purposes and reduce traffic congestion. Some commenters expressed that a reservation system for all the park units should be considered.</li> <li>▲ <b>Social Media Effects</b> – Commenters expressed the perception that more frequent coverage in social media may be contributing to substantially increased visitation in the last two years as travel websites promote the Reserve and Carmel River State Beach. Local residents have noted a marked increase in traffic and visitation to the area during this time period.</li> <li>▲ <b>Park Name</b> –Several commenters from the Native American community strongly urged naming the New State Park, "Ichxenta" (Ishxenta) or "Ichxenta Iwano" (i.e., Ichxenta village) to honor indigenous ancestors who inhabited this area up to 10,000 years ago. Other naming suggestions included retaining “Point Lobos Ranch” or considering “A. M. Allan Ranch.”</li> </ul>

#	Key Points Summarized from Public Input
	<p data-bbox="289 212 553 239">▲ <b>Other Comments:</b></p> <ul data-bbox="337 275 1479 716" style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="337 275 980 302">○ Provide bike lanes on roads and places for cyclists.</li><li data-bbox="337 323 1479 392">○ Perform a cumulative impact analysis including all the region’s park plans to understand the impacts of parking, wildfire, and other threats to the area residents from park use.</li><li data-bbox="337 413 1463 483">○ Develop a wildfire protection plan to address the threat of wildfire from park use, reduced vegetation management, drought, and the potential for wildfire from primitive camping.</li><li data-bbox="337 504 1192 531">○ Improve communication with the community to alleviate confusion.</li><li data-bbox="337 552 1321 579">○ Make recommendations about concessions specific as to services and location.</li><li data-bbox="337 600 1068 627">○ Allow for multi-use trails, including for mountain bicycles.</li><li data-bbox="337 648 1471 716">○ Reconsider including a residential environmental education facility at the inland area of the New State Park.</li></ul>