

Carnegie SVRA Partially Recirculated EIR Scoping Meeting Transcript

Description: Carnegie State Vehicle Recreation Area (SVRA) General Plan Recirculated Environmental Impact Report, Notice of Preparation Scoping Meeting. The meeting features a presentation, participant questions, and responses from the State Park Planning team. The meeting was held on Microsoft Teams. The meeting was held on Wednesday, September 30, 2026, from 5:30 to 6:30 p.m.

0:09

Hey, welcome everyone.

0:12

Thank you for joining the public scoping meeting for the partially recirculated environmental impact report for the Carnegie SVRA General Plan Update.

0:22

California State Parks Off Hwy.

0:23

Off-Highway Motor Vehicle Recreation or OHMVR Division is the lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act or CEQA for this project.

0:34

Next slide, my name is Katie Metraux and I'm the General Plan Manager for the general plan update and the contact for scoping comments.

0:44

I'm here with April Marson, who's the Altamont Sector Manager. State Parks is supported by our consultants, AECOM, for the general update plan and recirculated EIR process, including Valerie. Valerie, can you pronounce your last name, please?

1:09

Valarie Yruretagoyena, thank you.

1:14

And Danny DeBrito, who's the deputy project manager, Paola Pena, air quality scientist, and we also have Kathryn Tobias, who's our senior legal counsel for California State Parks.

1:29

On the next slide, I have an overview here of the agenda for today's meeting.

1:37

We'll discuss the project location and background, the requirements to recirculate the EIR, the scope and focus of the partially recirculated EIR, how to provide public comments, and then open the floor for questions and answers.

1:52

This meeting is being recorded, and the presentation will be uploaded to the project website after the meeting so that the public can go back and look at it at any time.

2:06

OK, next slide.

2:08

Carnegie SVRA is unincorporated and is in unincorporated Alameda and San Joaquin counties, roughly 15 miles east of Livermore and 12 miles West of Tracy.

2:20

Lawrence Livermore Laboratory property lies to the north; open space in rural ranchland to the east, west, and South.

2:30

Next slide.

2:32

The 1,533-acre site has seen OHV use since the 1940s and was operated as a private motorcycle park from 1970 to 1979.

2:43

State Parks purchased the site around 1980, and it became a unit of the State Park system.

2:50

The first General Plan was approved in 1981.

2:53

A 2016 effort covering the original SVRA plus a 3100-acre expansion area was challenged in several lawsuits, and the approvals were rescinded in 2021.

3:06

State Parks has since proceeded with a General Plan update limited to the original 1533 acres.

3:16

Next slide, now we're going to talk about the general plan update.

3:24

So, a general plan is the primary management document for each park unit within the California State Park system, including SVRAs, as a current general plan is required prior to the site-specific improvements at the SVRA.

3:39

Under Public Resources Code section 5002.2, the Carnegie SVRA General Plan update is limited to the original 1533-acre Carnegie State Park State Vehicle Recreation Area unit.

3:55

It establishes the ultimate purpose, vision, goals, and broad management guidelines for resource stewardship, visitor use, facilities and operations.

4:05

If reapproved, the General Plan update will supersede the 1981 General Plan, the unit's current operating general plan.

4:17

Next slide.

4:20

The OHMVR Commission certified the final EIR and adopted the General Plan update on October 24th, 2024.

4:28

Those actions were subject to a legal challenge.

4:31

On March 10th, 2026, the court granted the petition for writ of mandate on the single ground that the EIR did not evaluate a reasonable range of alternatives as required by CEQA and denied the petition on all other grounds.

4:46

In response to this ruling, the Commission rescinded the certification of the EIR and adoption of the General Plan Update on June 17th, 2026.

4:58

And now I will turn it over to Danny DeBrito.

5:02

Thanks, Katie.

5:03

So this NOP was prepared in compliance with the sequel guidelines, Sections 15082 and 15088.5.

5:12

Section 15088.5 provides that where revisions are limited to a few chapters or portions of an EIR, the lead agency needs only to recirculate the portions that have been modified.

5:22

Therefore, in this case, recirculation is limited to just the alternative chapter together with miscellaneous updates to the introduction, references, and list to prepare.

5:32

The prior 2024 EIR and planning documentation remains part of the public record and is available still on the Carnegie SVRA General Plan Update website.

5:41

Any updates needed due to changed conditions or regulatory updates will be explicitly identified in the partially recirculated EIR.

5:50

Excellent.

5:52

To summarize the 2024 EIR findings, the EIR found that with project design features, general plan goals and guidelines, and regulatory compliance, impacts were less than significant across all resource areas except for air quality.

6:07

Construction air quality impacts were found to be less than significant because the modeled emissions did not exceed the applicable air district thresholds.

6:14

Operational air quality impacts were found to be significant due to fugitive dust generation and exceedance of the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District thresholds.

6:24

These were determined to be significant and unavoidable because there were no feasible mitigation measures available to reduce those to a less than significant level.

6:35

So the focus of the revised alternatives chapter will be consistent with the Court's ruling, which will focus on a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that would attain most of the project objectives while avoiding or substantially lessening the project significant impacts which were on air quality.

6:52

As just discussed, the alternatives in the recirculated EIR will focus on reducing those significant and unavoidable impacts from implementation of the General Plan update and in alignment with Sequel Guidelines Section 15088.5.

7:06

Public comments should be limited to the scope of those alternatives.

7:10

Comments on the draft EIR, as published in 2024, were accepted during the prior public comment period and responded to in the final EIR, which is still available for review on the project website.

7:25

So how to comment during the scoping period?

7:28

To submit formal comments, they'll be accepted until 5:00 PM on October 19th, 2026

7:35

Please include in the body of your e-mail or your letter comments on Carnegie SVRA General Plan updates and submit e-mail comments to planning@parks.ca.gov or by mail to Katie Metraux at the address shown on your screen.

7:51

And as noted previously, please limit your comments to the scope of the additional alternatives to be analyzed in the partially recirculated draft EIR. Next slide.

8:02

So here are the next steps for the environmental and planning phases for this project.

8:06

After the comment period closes, State Parks will prepare the partially recirculated EIR focused on the revised alternatives chapter, incorporating the prior EIR analysis by reference as appropriate, and the partially recirculated EIR will be published for a 45-day review period during which public comments will be accepted specifically on that chapter.

8:27

The OHMVR Commission will then consider the partially recirculated EIR along with the prior final EIR and all planning documentation to determine whether to certify it as adequate under CEQA and whether to reapprove the General Plan update.

8:41

This would also include any related CEQA findings, statement of overriding considerations, and mitigation monitoring and reporting program.

8:53

So that concludes our presentation.

8:55

We'll now open the floor for questions and discussion today.

8:59

So, to submit an oral question or ask any questions or comments today, please use the raise your hand button on your screen, and staff will call on you to unmute.

9:11

Or if you're calling in by phone, please use *5, which will raise your hand, and then you'll be called upon to speak and provide your question or comment.

9:21

And as noted, please let me know your comments and discussion on the additional alternatives.

9:27

This is not an opportunity for formal comment on the NOP during the scoping.

9:31

And as provided previously, please provide those formal comments in writing to the contacts below to be included in the public record.

9:38

So once again, that is by e-mail to planning@parks.ca.gov and by mail to Katie Metraux at the address shown on your screen.

9:54

So we'll now open the floor for public comments.

9:56

Please raise your hand, and you'll be called upon to offer your comment or your question today.

10:10

Right now, we don't have any questions in the Q&A or anyone's hands.

10:24

Ok, Rose, when you raise your hand, give us a moment, and we'll unmute you.

10:32

Go ahead, Rose.

10:39

Hi, Rose.

10:40

We may not be able to hear you.

10:41

You might need to click unmute on your end.

10:44

All right, I think that worked.

10:46

Can you hear me now?

10:49

Wonderful.

10:49

Thank you.

10:50

Thank you for hosting this meeting.

10:51

And one of the questions I had is: from your perspective, as you're looking at the, you know, range of ramifications of this revision to the general plan update, what do you foresee as the primary impacts or range of impacts to OHV access or current writing opportunity as a result of how these alternatives may be framed?

11:28

Thank you, Rose, for your question.

11:32

Katie, would you like to answer that?

11:34

Sure.

11:35

We want to make.

11:36

So we want to make sure that we have your concern documented in this process so that we can evaluate the potential impacts to recreation in the EIR.

11:58

So we wouldn't know at this point because we haven't developed alternatives yet.

12:03

So that's why we're asking.

12:04

So when I'm hearing Rose, is that you want to make sure that we consider impacts to access and recreation when we are looking at these alternatives?

12:15

Is that correct?

12:17

Yeah, that's correct.

12:18

And I appreciate that information.

12:21

Katie, perhaps to be a little bit more specific on one element I'm thinking about is, you know, if we're taking a closer evaluation of air quality impacts, specifically, what additional actions or measures do you foresee being necessary as far as how air quality impacts would be defined, and then who the respective parties of impact are?

12:51

So I guess that's two pieces.

12:52

Let me break that down a little further on parties of impact.

12:57

Are we looking at air quality impact within Carnegie SVRA, within the broader county region like Alameda County, or within, you know, entities that border or have proximity to the SVRA? And then, well, let me stop there.

13:18

OK, I'll have a follow-up for that.

13:19

Let me just stop there.

13:21

Parties of impact will be my first question.

13:23

Yeah, and I can provide some input on that.

13:26

As Katie mentioned, we have not fully developed the alternatives yet, but similar to how the alternatives were analyzed in the previous ER, we would be following that same protocol, which, you know, looked at both the park and surrounding areas and follows the sequel guidelines for looking at air quality thresholds.

13:50

Very good.

13:51

OK.

13:51

I guess we're maybe part of my confusion is that I'm wondering if there might be some additional light shed is that, since this is resulting from a court proceeding, there was any information that might be helpful to us as an OHV user community in relationship to what kinds of allegations were made, where deficiencies were defined by the litigants, and the court order that requires modification?

14:20

Sure.

14:21

And Kathryn, would you like to answer that as far as it relates to the court order and what the deficiencies were and why the writ identified that new alternatives needed to be analyzed?

14:34

I think that would be good for Danae.

14:38

Our AG is also available; worked on the case just one, one second.

14:45

I think that Paula will have to unmute herself.

14:48

OK, good, good afternoon.

15:00

Are you able to hear me?

15:01

Yes, yes, we are.

15:06

Thank you.

15:06

And I apologize; I am not positioned to be on screen at the moment.

15:10

But in response to the question, there was a court ruling that addressed that the prior EIRs alternatives did not constitute a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed general plan update as required by CEQA.

15:31

Specifically, the court found that one of the alternatives, which involved it had a name and I apologize, I don't recall the name, but, you know, shutting down the SVRA to recreational use was not a viable alternative because it wouldn't meet most project objectives and then therefore wasn't part of a reasonable range.

15:56

And the court also determined that an additional alternative that added further air quality measures that would be implemented was not sufficiently an alternative to the general plan as a whole to comply with CEQA's requirement for a reasonable range.

16:20

So again, as the staff has identified, the focus was in fact on the significant air quality impacts of the project.

16:29

And I, I defer to staff, but I believe that was particulates or, you know, fugitive dust.

16:40

OK, that's hopeful.

16:44

Gosh, you know, I, I'm just going to preemptively apologize because the more questions I ask them for questions I have, but I don't see anybody else raising their hand.

16:53

So I don't want to dominate the meeting, but I'm happy to pass it off to somebody else.

16:59

But I keep asking questions, you know, unless somebody else doesn't want to pipe in.

17:04

So just so you know, we have, we have you, you're more than welcome to continue with this last question.

17:11

But maybe we just, once you finish this question, we pause.

17:15

And then if you want to ask another one, if no one jumps in, 'cause we have, we're trying to limit it to about 3 minutes per participant.

17:22

Oh my goodness, there's so much to cover.

17:24

OK, well, let me just ask one more question, and I'm happy to pause.

17:29

So, you know, from what Danae just shared, it looks like one of the alternatives that the court deemed was not reasonable dismiss was closing down all OHV access as a way to mitigate air quality impacts.

17:46

However, Carnegie SVRA is a legislatively designated OHV park, so that seems completely counterproductive to the very existence of the park itself.

17:57

And how would you propose that OHV enthusiasts who utilize Carnegie SVRA could address that in comments or in our comments for proposed alternatives in this round without just simply stating it's legislatively designated?

18:16

Do you, do you have a strategy that you can share from your perspectives?

18:24

Well, I would, I think I would refer back to your first question about visitor access.

18:32

And if that is a concern that comes up when, if it is with the alternatives, because we don't know yet if there's the concern is visitor access or something else that might limit recreation, then that would be something to bring up and they'll in the comment.

18:56

I don't know if anyone else has something else to share and I can and I can add to that.

19:01

And again, this isn't a strategy for, you know per se of how to continue the project, but it's the scoping process which was also done for the original EIR.

19:14

And the intent is to get public input on alternatives.

19:18

So as Katie mentioned, the best approach would be to identify the things that you would like to see in these alternatives, and then those will be part of the public record.

19:30

Yeah.

19:30

Very good.

19:31

OK.

19:32

Thank you.

19:32

I'll go ahead and pause.

19:33

I do have more questions, but I don't want to stop anybody else from being able to ask as well.

19:37

Totally understand.

19:39

And we do actually have what one other hand raised, and we have M McCartney McCarty, if you can unmute him.

19:47

Paula.

19:51

Yeah, it's.

19:52

Yeah.

19:53

Mike McGarity with Corva and I actually like the way that Rose Wynn is asking some very important questions specifically from the litigation perspective and what alternatives will potentially affect you're cutting out and we're not able to hear you.

20:33

Are you able to hear me now?

20:35

Yeah.

20:37

OK.

20:37

What I was saying was that I defer my time over to Rose and she was asking good questions.

20:43

And I think that from the public perspective, we'd like to hear some of those answers.

20:48

Thank you.

20:50

Thank you.

21:06

Go back to Rose.

21:09

There's no other; I don't see any other in the Q&A.

21:13

Are people's hands raised?

21:27

Rose, are you?

21:27

You said you had another; you had some more questions.

21:33

Yes, I do.

21:36

OK.

21:37

And thank you, Mike.

21:38

I appreciate how we can collaborate together on this because I know we share the same concerns.

21:45

And OK, so another question I had is in relationship to the original general plan update that was approved and then what ensued in the court order, were there any deficiencies identified in relationship to how air quality measures were defined or planned for implementation?

22:06

For example, if you could, you know, specify whether there were prevailing wind pattern studies that were integrated as part of the measures of analysis or implementation or ongoing monitoring.

22:25

Were there measurements of PM 10?

22:27

And if so, through what methodology?

22:30

Like, I know that might be a lot of detail to go into.

22:31

So maybe a high-level scope of, and actually that's all I get, where you're going with the question.

22:39

And again, the only thing that was upheld was that the range of alternatives that were analyzed was not adequate.

22:50

So all the air quality analysis was upheld, OK.

23:00

So the air quality analysis as defined in the original plan was upheld, but the range of alternatives was defined as deficient, correct?

23:11

OK, that's helpful.

23:13

As I'm trying to parse apart what we can extract from the original plan versus what we're proposing as a range of alternatives in the forthcoming revisions.

23:23

And as part of the that's why we are focusing on just a partial recirculation of the EIR to focus on those areas that need to be revised based on the right.

23:38

I see.

23:39

OK.

23:42

OK.

23:42

Another question I have is somewhat touching back on the parties of impact.

23:48

Could you help me understand who is impacted beyond staff and voluntary users, who you know of their own volition go into Carnegie SVRA to enjoy the park?

24:03

Who beyond the scope of staff and users could be in the range of parties of impact since it is in a rural area?

24:10

And I know that, like, there's the lab that borders on the north, but they're pretty much self-contained.

24:16

What other what other parties might we be missing in our concept of who could be impacted by air quality?

24:29

And I guess I have a question for you, and I'm not sure the reason for the question or how that relates to the alternative.

24:39

Well, the reason is that any alternative has to address perspective impact, right?

24:46

And so if air quality is the focal part of this recirculation, then I guess I'm feeling a little deficient in my understanding of how the original general plan update was viewed as insufficient by the court.

25:07

And again, it wasn't that it was viewed as insufficient.

25:10

The only area, and it was the sequel document, was identified as being inefficient in identifying a range of alternatives.

25:25

So it's, it sounds like, and correct me if I'm wrong, this sounds like the primary hinge in all this is that the range of alternatives didn't include a 0 OHV access alternative.

25:40

Is that accurate?

25:43

A little bit it did, but because of the way it was presented and because it did not address the objectives of the general plan, it was considered infeasible.

25:56

Excuse me.

25:57

And therefore the court ruled that it wasn't really an alternative because it was infeasible.

26:07

If I could also just try and add a little bit more clarity around the alternatives chapter, it's just one chapter of the EIR itself.

26:14

And as required by CEQA, you have to look at potentially feasible alternatives that would address some of the significant impacts that are identified in the other portions of the EIR across all resource areas.

26:26

So if there were significant impacts in other resource areas, the alternatives would really need to focus on those specific impacts and, you know, come up with modified lane use concepts or different use patterns that could potentially address those significant impacts that are identified in the EIR.

26:43

So it's, it's one specific component of the overall EIR.

26:47

It's not the entire EIR that was found efficient.

26:50

It's really just that range of alternatives it's looked at in the EIR, and that's what we'll be focusing on for the partially recirculated EIR.

27:00

Certainly.

27:00

OK, I appreciate that clarification as well, because that's the premise that I was arriving at as I'm reviewing the information that's been shared and looking back on the original general plan.

27:10

And so, you know, I think our part of our shared goal for, you know, at least some, perhaps that all of those who are on this call and those who aren't able to join is that, you know, we want to see OHV recreation continue at Carnegie SVRA, of course, in a safe and reasonable manner in compliance with all existing laws and regulations.

27:34

And we also want to see Carnegie SVRA and state Parks not implicated by future and ongoing litigation.

27:43

And so I'm looking for ways to provide comments in the scoping.

27:48

That would strengthen the state park's position to continue facilitating Carnegie SVRA as an OHV park, as it is its legislative designation, in a manner that would prevent future litigation as well as stop the current litigation.

28:04

And that's why I'm encountering some gaps where maybe I'm asking some tedious questions, but I'm really trying to tease out of the woodwork, you know, what would be the most effective proposed alternatives that we can offer in scoping that would accomplish those goals?

28:30

So I guess that's a rhetorical question and a statement, but any feedback you have, I'd appreciate.

28:39

Danny, did you want to add anything like I previously mentioned?

28:43

You know, all the concerns that you have are important and should be included in your comments.

28:49

But Danny, if you had anything else to add, yeah, I think what we'd be looking for insight from the public on or open to feedback from the public on is alternatives that could feasibly reduce some of those air quality impacts specifically for fugitive dust from OHV use in the park.

29:08

So we're currently working through a range of alternatives.

29:12

Everything is on the table at this time.

29:14

And so we're specifically looking at alternatives that address that specific impact related to air quality.

29:19

So no other forms of air, air quality, no criteria air pollutants like specifically for particulate matter destinations and the impacts that would result from that.

29:30

So in providing public comments, I think if that could be the area of focus that would be extremely helpful for the team to make sure that we consider all options at this time.

29:45

OK, thank you.

29:47

And, and Rose, what we had talked about before is, like, I wonder- I want to know what your concerns are, if you know, even though we don't know what alternatives to comment on, which you will have a chance to see. But what, what are some of those concerns?

30:02

And I think you mentioned those already.

30:04

But also if you've got ideas on like, like, like Danny was saying that maybe we would never consider how we can, we could lower the air quality issues and the park, like what could we do?

30:21

What could we implement that may help reduce that?

30:25

So we would love to hear, you know, suggestions like that too.

30:33

Very good.

30:33

Certainly, I'll be putting my mind in that direction.

30:36

And I actually have another question then.

30:39

Has there been any measures of air quality standards that Carnegie SVRA has historically been found in violation of or deficiency in meeting?

30:56

I don't have that information.

30:57

I don't know if I'm a State Park staff either April or Katie, if you have information on that.

31:03

But I don't have information on it.

31:06

No, I'm not.

31:07

I'm not familiar with any issues with air quality at this point.

31:12

Yeah.

31:14

So, so per our knowledge as at least in this group at this time and I'll investigate further, but we don't have any known violations of air quality standards that have historically occurred at Carnegie SVRA.

31:29

That is correct.

31:30

We have none that we're aware of.

31:33

OK.

31:34

So if this is recirculated, EIR, is, is recirculated because there's a possible deficiency and meeting air quality standards and not assessing impacts of air quality standards is how has that been substantiated?

31:52

So I'm going to try and take a stab at this.

31:55

The air quality standards, as we've said before, have been upheld.

32:01

Where we were lacking was having more than a few alternatives.

32:07

The they want to see more alternatives to the general plan specifically as it relates to this category.

32:20

That's the way I understand it.

32:22

Am I correct, Katie?

32:24

Yeah.

32:24

So, ANU, we had three alternatives, 11 was to, you know, have no changes.

32:33

One was to implement the general plan, and I think I was to close the would be potentially to close the park which would eliminate air quality concerns.

32:42

I don't know if there were any others that examples that we can talk about from the previous general plan.

32:49

So we're looking at something, you know, it's something else that we could consider besides those, those extremes that could help lower the impacts to or mitigate the impacts to air quality, if that makes more sense.

33:08

Danae, can you weigh in here at all?

33:18

Hello, I can give it a try.

33:22

We ask under CEQA and, particularly, CEQA guidelines Section 15126.6, that an EIR is required to study a range of reasonable alternatives, and agencies craft those alternatives as ways to reduce a project's impacts.

33:50

Here the impact to be reduced is the air quality impact.

33:55

I will defer to others to talk about the details of that impact, but the goal is to develop alternatives focused on that significant impact and determine if there are feasible, at least potentially feasible ways to reduce that impact above and beyond what the general plan update the proposed project does.

34:20

Does that help Kathryn?

34:21

Is that what you were looking for?

34:23

Yeah, I thought, I think it is.

34:27

I thought might be able to give some sense of what the judge said that of what she thought.

34:39

I don't know.

34:40

That's I'm really good thoughts.

34:42

So I apologize.

34:43

Sure.

34:45

So again, the court held that the range of alternatives in the prior EIR was insufficient under CEQA because of the shutdown.

34:56

The park, as Katie said, the one extreme wasn't even a potentially feasible alternative based in part on the statute making Carnegie and OHV park, etcetera.

35:10

And then the other alternative that involved additional measures to address air quality, the court did not find that to be a real alternative to the project as a whole.

35:24

And so I think Katie is spot on in describing that the goal is to find alternatives that can be studied that meet most project objectives and can address the significant air quality impact of the proposed project in some fashion and study those as part of the recirculated EIR.

35:52

Thanks.

35:55

And we do have mics, hands raised.

36:05

Yeah, thank you.

36:06

So I think what is confusing is if there haven't been any studies or if we don't have any data on if we violated or if Carnegie has violated any of the PM 10 levels, how do we know what alternatives even suggest?

36:28

If one of the alternatives is to shut the park down, you would think that the PM 10 levels are to the highest degree to be harmful to the public.

36:38

So then that would be the extreme case.

36:40

But in terms of CEQA, what is CEQA's measure on PM 10 levels?

36:47

I guess that's the question.

36:48

And then the other question would be, well, what's the history behind Carnegie and the PM 10 levels at Carnegie?

36:55

And that would be the other question isn't, but I don't think anybody has those answers.

37:02

Well, the park, I could try this, and Paula, I think that would be something that you might be able to answer.

37:10

But so the park lies in two different air basins, Bay Area and also San Joaquin two different they've had they have two different requirements for levels of what's acceptable for various pollutants.

37:30

And because of that we have two different ways, you know, two we have to meet all both of those requirements.

37:40

And so one of those was, you know, for the Bay Area has a lot more restrictions or levels.

37:48

This is why I want Paola to kind of explain what that means the differences.

37:53

So we have to meet both of those and there's a significant impact to those.

38:00

Yeah, I'm, I'm happy to speak to that.

38:02

So for this project that goes across 2 air basins, the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin and the San Joaquin Valley Air Basin, respectively, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District.

38:18

Under the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, those thresholds are average daily thresholds.

38:25

So, yeah, the previous EIR

38:28

actually found that on an average daily basis emissions would not be exceeded.

38:35

So the only significant impact in the air quality analysis was related to PM 10 under the

annual emissions, which was compared to the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District thresholds that are on an annual basis.

38:53

Does that answer your question?

38:57

Well, no, because although that's kind of a definition and a regulatory definition of what the, you know, the different pollution control districts have.

39:12

But how do we, I mean, how did the judge even come to that distinction that the, the first draft didn't adequately cover the, the PM 10 levels when they didn't even know what the PM 10 levels were at Carnegie?

39:32

So I mean, what are you measuring it against?

39:34

What are you usually, what are you using to measure it against?

39:37

I can speak to the analysis that was done previously, but I know that this is going a bit out of the scope of the scope of the scope of the scoping meeting which is focused on the alternatives.

39:46

But just to clarify, the court did uphold the air quality analysis and the emissions evaluated in that original EIR were for the proposed general plan emissions that are based on future growth.

40:01

So there is no not a need to measure existing.

40:07

Air quality levels at the park in order to estimate the emissions associated with future growth.

40:12

So the impact is based on what the future growth would cause in terms of operational emissions.

40:24

And if I could jump in, because Paola does great and she's a great air quality person and I'm, you know, like most of us get it just enough.

40:34

But if I could just add that as she mentioned, it was analyzed in the EIR and that was upheld and it was the preferred alternative is what was being analyzed and what would if approved would move forward that the alternatives were also analyzed in comparison in the same way that the preferred alternative was.

41:03

And based on the information that was received to the judge felt that those alternatives did not add it.

41:15

There weren't enough alternatives to adequately adequately analyzed in as an alternative to the preferred.

41:30

Yeah, I guess from an OHV standpoint, it's almost like we're being kind of shoved into a corner, into a box, so to speak.

41:38

Because naturally the only alternatives to that, the judge would, would, would love to see.

41:44

And so would the people that, you know, pushed against it with litigation would be to shorten the hours of the park to reduce the number of OHVs and motorcycles and, you know, OHV vehicles that can access the park.

42:03

I mean, if nobody's there, then the air quality from that park is going to be at a minimal amount.

42:11

So rather than the alternative of shutting the park down, what are the other alternatives?

42:17

Either limit the amount of OHVs that are there, which is going to impact it being an SVRA, or you limit the hours, which still limits the amount of OHVs that are at the park.

42:31

So I mean, the only alternatives that the judge is going to want to see are a reduction in OHV use.

42:40

I guess the other one would be water, which always reduces dust.

42:46

So I mean, like at other, at other parks where they have tracks and you know, dirt bike tracks or, or tracks where they, where they do the motorcycle riding, you know, they'll wet the tracks down.

43:05

And like at Hungry Valley SVRA, they have water to mitigate the dust.

43:10

But at the SVRA there at Carnegie, I mean, you got such a big riding area, you know, how much, how much, how much water can you put down in order to reduce the dust?

43:22

The other part is a rock and RIP rap.

43:24

I mean, the more Rock You have, the less dust you have.

43:28

So I mean, those, those would be a couple alternatives to suggest.

43:33

But ultimately what the judge and what the litigators are going to want to see is a reduction of use.

43:40

I mean, is that it we're, we're the, the purpose of the recirculating the EIR is not to reanalyze the air quality for the preferred alternative in the general plan.

43:52

It is to identify feasible alternative that reduce air quality impacts.

44:03

We're not here, or the EIR recirculation is not meant to come up with a solution that's going to reduce the impacts, but the alternative that would be feasible to reduce the impacts.

44:23

So again, the thing is that what was proposed wasn't feasible.

44:28

We have to show that we're looking at feasible alternatives.

44:32

Then ultimately when that EIR is recirculated and the general plan if needed is updated, it'll go to the Commission and they'll, you know, make the choice of either to approve or not.

44:52

I don't know if anyone has anything to add.

44:54

No, I mean, I totally understand all that except, you know, not going back to the to the original EIR, but talking about, I mean the alternatives are directly related to the air quality and they want to have other alternatives that would help reduce that and again, they are alternatives.

45:13

So it's for the Commission to decide how to implement the general plan.

45:23

All right.

45:23

Thank you.

45:42

You have a couple of hands up Mark, Mark Beers, do you want to we'll unmute you and you can provide your question or comment.

45:54

Yeah, thank you.

45:55

Just a quick question.

45:57

You know, I haven't had a chance to read through all of the documents.

45:59

You have a normal job, but is the court considering the as an alternative the fact that 22 and newer dirt bikes, essentially all dirt bikes can no longer be operated on public land?

46:13

Is that being factored in?

46:21

I could respond to this one.

46:23

We would consider this.

46:24

I mean, at the time that the original EIR was circulated, that was already, you know, a part of the analysis that we are considering as part of that ongoing legislative change.

46:36

And now that we're taking a look at these different alternatives, we'll consider the most current regulations that would be applicable to those alternatives.

46:44

As it relates to air quality.

46:47

However, specifically for the significant impact that we're focused on, it's related to fugitive dust.

46:52

So it doesn't necessarily have to do with the emission standards of the OHVS themselves, but more so the dust that would be produced by the activity itself.

47:04

Oh, OK, OK.

47:05

And that, yeah, thank you.

47:06

That's, that's again something I was aware of.

47:09

I just, when I hear emissions, I think of carbon dioxide or whatever.

47:12

So this is basically because of the dust being put up in the air or whatever from the dirt bikes.

47:20

That that's correct.

47:21

Yes.

47:22

And comparing that to the significance thresholds by the two air districts.

47:26

OK.

47:27

So again, the comments should focus on ideas or ways to keep OHV use, but alternative ways that would reduce dust.

47:42

That's correct.

47:44

And if I could just circle back to comments, the comment that Mike brought up, you know, ideas like dust suppressant, watering, you know, use it use of RIP rap or other, you know, chemical dust suppressants.

47:57

These are all ideas that were, you know, we're seeking input on as it relates to being able to address the issue of dust generation over the lifetime of the general plan.

48:06

So those are those are potential options to explore and to potentially, you know, flesh out in in your comment letters on the during the scoping.

48:16

OK.

48:17

And I don't want to take any more time since it seems like the other people have way better questions than I do.

48:22

But again, just to, you know, in terms of the comments, to make them as helpful as possible.

48:29

So someone else brought up like, you know, saying, well, close the park for two days in a row or something.

48:36

So what they're measuring is dust over a certain time period, like X amount of time, like days or something?

48:45

Or is that right?

48:48

It's, it's an annual threshold.

48:50

I, I believe Paulo, correct me if I'm wrong on this, but I think the threshold that was exceeded was an annual threshold.

48:58

So it's, you know, measuring over the life of or over the course of an entire year, how many tons of dust would be kicked up?

49:06

OK.

49:07

And then, sorry, one last question, and again, I apologize, I'm not up to date on all the litigation or anything, but would it be- this is just for this county, right?

49:19

So for example, Prairie City or Hollister SVRA, this, they've never been impacted by this or conducted their own studies or have their ideas of alternatives correct.

49:33

This is specifically for Carnegie SVRA and the applicable air district thresholds there for different SVRAs.

49:42

If they were to undertake different projects, they would have to do the analysis as it relates to specific county or air district thresholds that are applicable there.

49:50

But this is specifically for the thresholds for the air basins that Carnegie's located in.

49:57

OK.

49:57

All right.

49:58

Thank you.

50:02

And we have Rose's raised her hand.

50:06

Yeah, thank you.

50:07

And actually, Mark, I appreciate your questions.

50:09

You touched on a few that I had to, but another question I had is: were the litigation petitioners or the judge, did they provide any reference to or examples of sequel planning documents that were found adequate in measuring air quality standards?

50:34

I don't believe so, but Katie or Catherine, I don't know if they provided examples, if that makes sense.

50:45

Is that what you're asking?

50:47

Yeah, like if the if the petitioners said Hey, this is deficient and it should be found sufficient like these were or if the judge said we agree, I agree this is deficient because I've seen other planning documents that I believe are sufficient.

51:05

I think that would be something if an enough Denay, if you're able to answer that question, I will.

51:14

I will give it a shot, which is no, I, I don't believe that issue was framed quite that way.

51:20

But in the court document, the court noted that there were commenters in the prior process that had suggested alternatives that were not explored.

51:32

I don't have those in front of me, but that was a consideration that the court made.

51:39
OK.

51:40
And are all public comments from the previous public comment period still available for public view?

51:48
Yes, they're on the state parks website.

51:52
Perfect.

51:52
And we can put that we can put that in the chat too.

51:56
Excellent.

51:56
Thank you.

51:57
Or the Q&A?

52:22
I'm going to be putting the link to the General Plan web page in the chat, but you can also search for it on our State Park web page if you type in Carnegie General Plan.

52:38
Do we have any more questions?

52:50
Actually, I cannot put it in the chat because I did in the, I think you can.

52:55
Oh, no, we can't put it in the Q&A.

52:57
Yeah, if it were going to search for Carnegie General Plan or Carnegie VRA General Plan in Google, it should take you right to the web page.

53:11
And the notice of preparation also has the link to the, the, the project web page.

53:18
Well, you can find that information.

53:25

And if I'm just looking at the web page now, it is about halfway down the page, and it's part of the 2024 general plans.

53:38

And so it'll be under previous planning and environmental documents on that web page.

53:43

You'll see it.

53:46

Yeah.

53:46

And I'm going to put it; I think I can put it in the Q&A also looks like a few of us are dropping it in the Q&A.

53:57

So now there's a few links in there.

54:00

Oh, OK.

54:00

They're not showing up on my end.

54:06

Wonderful.

54:06

Thank you.

54:07

And I also wanted to remind folks that this recording is going to be part of the project page under the scoping.

54:19

Notice of preparation.

54:21

So once we finalize this meeting, work on getting that recording available and then I will send out an e-mail to everyone letting you know that the recording's available.

54:36

So there may be a, there may be some folks who weren't able to make a comment, and they can rewatch this discussion.

54:45

And again, the comments that you're making tonight, your questions are for us to consider, but we won't be able to have it in the public record and really consider it unless you have it in writing, either by e-mail or US mail.

55:13

Danny, do you want to talk about the end of the scoping.

55:16

Skip those dates again.

55:20

Yeah, absolutely.

55:23

October 19th at 5:00 PM is the cut off for submitting formal scoping comments.

55:30

So please provide your comments beforehand by e-mail or by mail to the address that was shown on screen, and we look forward to hearing from you.

55:44

And also if you've got additional questions, you can e-mail that planning at parks.ca.gov and I'll check out.

55:51

I will get back to you.

55:53

So monitor that daily.

56:14

Are there any additional questions?

56:35

All right, hearing none, I think we could close things out for the evening.

56:40

Appreciate everyone's feedback today and we'll look forward to seeing those formal comments as we move the project forward.

56:50

Thank you, everyone.

56:53

Thank you.