



**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 flip charts.

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.

Several appendices are associated with this summary report to provide original workshop materials and public comments:

- Appendix A: Public Workshop 2 Agenda
- Appendix B: Public Workshop 2 Newsletter
- Appendix C: Public Workshop 2 PowerPoint Presentation
- Appendix D: Preference Exercise Materials and Flip Charts
- Appendix E: Public Comments Received During and Following Public Workshop 2
- Appendix F: Agency and Organization Comment Letters
- Appendix G: List of Commenters

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 the 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 help with 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 deaths 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).

