

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: John Vallee <reef_magnet@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 8:26 AM
To: Coastal Hollister
Cc: Hollister Ranch
Subject: Hollister Ranch Access Program

Dear Commissioners-

I would like to provide some personal input on the Hollister Ranch issue. I am a 69 year old physician and outdoor enthusiast and have lived in Santa Barbara for 40 years, in southern California for 60 years. I have a background in marine biology, have a longstanding interest in coastal issues, and am a member of Channelkeepers.

I have had the opportunity to visit Hollister Ranch many times over many years and have followed the access issue closely. I know Hollister Ranch to be the last pristine section of California coast in southern California, untouched by crowds, litter, and environmental degradation. The abundance and diversity of marine life is unique, given its proximity to Point Conception. Furthermore, the marine and coastal ecosystems are largely untouched and unchanged in this stretch of coast, unlike the rest of southern California. It is in the best interests of California that it remain so.

The upcoming review of the 1982 Hollister Ranch Public Access Program concerns me. This program is badly outdated; if implemented, it would result in overcrowding of the Ranch, environmental degradation, and irreparable damage. The 1982 Program deserves a careful, complete, unrushed revision at this point. Such deliberation should certainly include the principal owner of this land, the Hollister Ranch Owners Association. I know that the environment and resources of Hollister Ranch have been closely and carefully protected by the current owner; their input and suggestions are critical.

The State of California is not financially or structurally capable of developing this stretch of coast into a state park as per the 1982 agreement. Much more time and effort are needed. How will a program of massive public access be financed? How will environmental ruination be prevented? How will we keep this from turning the pristine stretch of coast into yet another crowded southern California beach park?

Finally, on a personal note, my hobbies include surfing and tidal biology. When I visit Hollister Ranch I find abundant tidal ecology and uncrowded surfing; it is like going back to the California of my youth. This is a magical stretch of our coast. Please don't allow it to devolve into an overcrowded mess.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

John H Vallee MD
41 Tierra Cielo Lane
Santa Barbara, CA
93105

reef_magnet@yahoo.com

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Locklin, Linda@Coastal
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 10:35 AM
To: Coastal Hollitser
Subject: FW: Hollister Ranch Plan Update
Attachments: Comments on public access at Hollister Ranch 2.docx

From: Mark Robinson [<mailto:markkrobinson@verizon.net>]
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 7:14 AM
To: Locklin, Linda@Coastal; Hudson, Steve@Coastal; Carey, Barbara@Coastal; Phelps, Jacqueline@Coastal
Subject: Hollister Ranch Plan Update

Dear Commission Officials,

I was unable to provide the attached public comment on Hollister Ranch through your website (technical problems) or by FAX (no response). So I am taking the liberty of emailing it to you in the hopes that it can be considered before the meeting this Wednesday.

Thank you for considering these comments (attached Word file).

Mark Robinson MD
Bishop CA
(760) 914 2990

Comments on public access at Hollister Ranch:

I lived on the California coast for 20 years and have access to the Hollister Ranch through my family, but have never lived there. I am familiar with the entire coast of Southern California from almost four decades of travel and recreation. I am in favor of access as required by law. Limited and non-destructive access.

The public already has access to the Hollister Ranch beach by boat or by walking (only at low tide) which is consistent with the letter of the law. Additional access comes through Hollister Ranch Conservancy hosted educational programs. What is not present is easy motorized mass access over land. The law does not require that. Such access to the Hollister Ranch will degrade it severely. Based on my travels, it is the least damaged and best preserved of all of the beach areas along the entire So Cal coast. Nearby State Parks along the coast are good and beautiful places but show grossly more human impact and degradation of the natural environment than Hollister Ranch. Mass access always means some visitors who abuse the place: garbage, cigarette butts, noise, campfires, trampling, dog poop, etc. For many visitors these parks are a mere recreational venue and many, perhaps most, have little if any real connection to the place or strong motives to keep it whole. Use it and pass on. Hollister is an example of outstandingly successful preservation and low impact sustainable use by the locals who own, live in and care for the place rather than use it simply as a recreational venue.

The limited access and good stewardship which protects the Ranch from being overrun are ironically the main reasons why it is so attractive. Desirable places such as Yosemite and the Grand Canyon are being "loved to death" by hordes of motorized passers through even with administered access programs and limitations. Even places with strict limits and absent motorized access such as the wilderness around Mt Whitney and the John Muir Trail are severely affected and degraded by the activities of hundreds of daily visitors. Even though the majority of these wilderness travelers do the best they can to minimize their impact, masses of humans always harm an environment. What reason is there to do this to Hollister Ranch which so far has escaped this fate?

Certainly in a comprehensive multi-Agency coastal access plan the Hollister Ranch should not be singled out as the only coastal property near Gaviota to be opened to mass access, car camping and shuttle busses. If it is singled out, then the people who live there should have representation on the task force. A comprehensive plan should include the former Bixby Ranch, a more logical place for what is being considered, now run by the Nature Conservancy as a limited access coastal preserve. Not to mention Vandenberg AFB and the ranches east of Gaviota State Park.

It seems unlikely that the practicalities of access have been carefully considered what with all the heavily publicized ideological and legal wrangling among the various parties absorbing everybody's attention. The road along the beach is steep and winding and would probably need extensive expensive and scarring rebuilding and maintenance to handle the increased traffic. That traffic would make it hard to use and emergency access for ambulances, fire equipment and law enforcement would be slow and difficult but inevitably much more frequently needed. Daily use by the local people could become an unpleasant ordeal. Cows use the road. It's a real cattle

ranch on an agricultural preserve. To keep that agricultural work off of the public access and away from the hikers would be complex and expensive.

A trail along the road could be a danger to hikers from vehicles especially because of visibility issues. Because the road goes up and down it would not be a logical hiking trail and likely to be too much for casual walkers who can be expected to run into problems (No water! No shade! No place to sit and eat! Too many hills! So terribly windy! Where can I relieve myself? That brush looks like a good ashtray. Maybe I should ask the people in that house to drive me home.). Such unprepared day hikers would need help but be unable to summon a rescue with their cell phones. The temptation to cut south from the road directly to the ocean and to the presumed beach would be great and inevitably taken. This leads often enough to threatening terrain, poison oak, impenetrable brush, private homes and unstable cliffs. Search and Rescue. What will be done with the beach lovers who miss the last shuttle and can't walk back in the dark? With 180,000 or more potential new people on this land each year all of this and much worse is certain to occur. Again and again:

It will be an expensive proposition to deal with it all. Forever. Governor Brown seemed to know this when he suggested that the old access plan was not fiscally responsible. Things haven't gotten cheaper since 1982, the year of the original plan some 36 years ago. Can Parks and Recreation Budgets afford all of this expansion along with new rangers, maintenance, law enforcement, safety, monitoring etc.? I thought it was difficult just to maintain what already exists.

The costs to the natural world at the Hollister Ranch deserve some consideration too. The ranch littoral and adjacent hills and valleys are alive in a way that no other So Cal location can match. Almost like the Channel Islands off the coast (which also have very seriously limited access). The country inland has native plants and animals living something like the way they did when the Chumash controlled who could easily get to the beach. Would this ecosystem be improved by increased human use (and unfortunately but inevitably human abuse) of the place? Real living tide pools, abundant near shore life, even abalone are still there. How long could that survive a pick over by the picnickers and fisher people?

Whenever a Hollister Ranch native wants to build a new structure or make some change a long and expensive process involving biology, archaeology, and geology reports and regulatory approval taking years and massive effort is required. Anything likely to damage native vegetation or habitat, to create an eyesore or otherwise degrade the environment is forbidden. The Coastal Commission in part sees that this is so. I think that a competent professional assessment of the biological, archaeological, geological, visual and cultural impact of the work needed to accommodate hundreds of new visitors each day in a State Park like venue would reveal damage perhaps orders of magnitude greater than the sum of all that has been done at Hollister Ranch so far. Road building, Trail construction, Water extraction, Buildings, Bathrooms, Parking lots, Campgrounds, Waste disposal facilities. How can this be done to the same exacting standards required of the Hollister Ranch residents by regulators including the Coastal Commission? Probably it cannot.

The people who live there shouldn't be steamrollered either. Their quality of life will with certainty be quite severely diminished. Great collective effort, discipline and expense were

required to bring the place to its current exemplary state. Is that to be now taken away and harvested in an aggressive fashion and exploited so that anybody on a whim can easily enjoy a novel place to picnic on the beach or take a moody walk? So that surfers can with small effort get to some formerly less crowded than average waves? That would not be a good way to treat the people who have found a way to live in a place without destroying it.

The best, least expensive and most practical approach to preserving this outstanding place is to keep access the way it is now. This is a no cost option to the taxpayer. It is a proven success. Geography has already placed natural barriers to casual coastal visitation, as is the case for most of the coast anyway. The public can and will always be able to access the beach to the extent required by law. But it does now take some effort, some knowledge, some skill and real desire. Which is good.

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: william Broadhead <boardwalker73@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 11:20 AM
To: Coastal Hollister
Subject: Public Access?

Please don't set a precedent that erodes Private Property Rights.
America was founded on a desire to be able to own Property without the fear of it being taken through insidious means such as Taxes, Fines and Extortion.
The Hollister Ranch is a rare jewel of pristine beauty being managed as only Mother Nature would desire.
Don't ruin it!
Respectfully submitted by,
William Broadhead

--
Sent from Gmail Mobile

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: william Broadhead <boardwalker73@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 11:43 AM
To: Coastal/Hollitser
Subject: \$\$\$& The Cost

Before making a final decision on Public access please consider the costs of a Public access program in a remote area like The Gaviota Coast!

Is the Costal Commission prepared to construct and maintain the trails, roads

Facilities etc. Where will the public go-to-The - bathroom? And don't forget the Personal Injury Lawyers.

There will be increased injury and death if You provide access to wild remote areas.

Please consider the costs.

Sincerely,

Bill Broadhead

--

Sent from Gmail Mobile

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Mark Robinson <robfam4@pacbell.net>
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 12:07 PM
To: Coastal Hollitser
Subject: Comments
Attachments: Comments on public access at Hollister Ranch 2.docx

Also sent to some officials earlier.

Thanks,
Mark Robinson
Bishop CA
(760) 914 2990

Comments on public access at Hollister Ranch:

I lived on the California coast for 20 years and have access to the Hollister Ranch through my family, but have never lived there. I am familiar with the entire coast of Southern California from almost four decades of travel and recreation. I am in favor of access as required by law. Limited and non-destructive access.

The public already has access to the Hollister Ranch beach by boat or by walking (only at low tide) which is consistent with the letter of the law. Additional access comes through Hollister Ranch Conservancy hosted educational programs. What is not present is easy motorized mass access over land. The law does not require that. Such access to the Hollister Ranch will degrade it severely. Based on my travels, it is the least damaged and best preserved of all of the beach areas along the entire So Cal coast. Nearby State Parks along the coast are good and beautiful places but show grossly more human impact and degradation of the natural environment than Hollister Ranch. Mass access always means some visitors who abuse the place: garbage, cigarette butts, noise, campfires, trampling, dog poop, etc. For many visitors these parks are a mere recreational venue and many, perhaps most, have little if any real connection to the place or strong motives to keep it whole. Use it and pass on. Hollister is an example of outstandingly successful preservation and low impact sustainable use by the locals who own, live in and care for the place rather than use it simply as a recreational venue.

The limited access and good stewardship which protects the Ranch from being overrun are ironically the main reasons why it is so attractive. Desirable places such as Yosemite and the Grand Canyon are being "loved to death" by hordes of motorized passers through even with administered access programs and limitations. Even places with strict limits and absent motorized access such as the wilderness around Mt Whitney and the John Muir Trail are severely affected and degraded by the activities of hundreds of daily visitors. Even though the majority of these wilderness travelers do the best they can to minimize their impact, masses of humans always harm an environment. What reason is there to do this to Hollister Ranch which so far has escaped this fate?

Certainly in a comprehensive multi-Agency coastal access plan the Hollister Ranch should not be singled out as the only coastal property near Gaviota to be opened to mass access, car camping and shuttle busses. If it is singled out, then the people who live there should have representation on the task force. A comprehensive plan should include the former Bixby Ranch, a more logical place for what is being considered, now run by the Nature Conservancy as a limited access coastal preserve. Not to mention Vandenberg AFB and the ranches east of Gaviota State Park.

It seems unlikely that the practicalities of access have been carefully considered what with all the heavily publicized ideological and legal wrangling among the various parties absorbing everybody's attention. The road along the beach is steep and winding and would probably need extensive expensive and scarring rebuilding and maintenance to handle the increased traffic. That traffic would make it hard to use and emergency access for ambulances, fire equipment and law enforcement would be slow and difficult but inevitably much more frequently needed. Daily use by the local people could become an unpleasant ordeal. Cows use the road. It's a real cattle

ranch on an agricultural preserve. To keep that agricultural work off of the public access and away from the hikers would be complex and expensive.

A trail along the road could be a danger to hikers from vehicles especially because of visibility issues. Because the road goes up and down it would not be a logical hiking trail and likely to be too much for casual walkers who can be expected to run into problems (No water! No shade! No place to sit and eat! Too many hills! So terribly windy! Where can I relieve myself? That brush looks like a good ashtray. Maybe I should ask the people in that house to drive me home.). Such unprepared day hikers would need help but be unable to summon a rescue with their cell phones. The temptation to cut south from the road directly to the ocean and to the presumed beach would be great and inevitably taken. This leads often enough to threatening terrain: poison oak, impenetrable brush, private homes and unstable cliffs. Search and Rescue. What will be done with the beach lovers who miss the last shuttle and can't walk back in the dark? With 180,000 or more potential new people on this land each year all of this and much worse is certain to occur. Again and again.

It will be an expensive proposition to deal with it all. Forever. Governor Brown seemed to know this when he suggested that the old access plan was not fiscally responsible. Things haven't gotten cheaper since 1982, the year of the original plan some 36 years ago. Can Parks and Recreation Budgets afford all of this expansion along with new rangers, maintenance, law enforcement, safety, monitoring etc.? I thought it was difficult just to maintain what already exists.

The costs to the natural world at the Hollister Ranch deserve some consideration too. The ranch littoral and adjacent hills and valleys are alive in a way that no other So Cal location can match. Almost like the Channel Islands off the coast (which also have very seriously limited access). The country inland has native plants and animals living something like the way they did when the Chumash controlled who could easily get to the beach. Would this ecosystem be improved by increased human use (and unfortunately but inevitably human abuse) of the place? Real living tide pools, abundant near shore life, even abalone are still there. How long could that survive a pick over by the picnickers and fisher people?

Whenever a Hollister Ranch native wants to build a new structure or make some change a long and expensive process involving biology, archaeology, and geology reports and regulatory approval taking years and massive effort is required. Anything likely to damage native vegetation or habitat, to create an eyesore or otherwise degrade the environment is forbidden. The Coastal Commission in part sees that this is so. I think that a competent professional assessment of the biological, archaeological, geological, visual and cultural impact of the work needed to accommodate hundreds of new visitors each day in a State Park like venue would reveal damage perhaps orders of magnitude greater than the sum of all that has been done at Hollister Ranch so far. Road building. Trail construction. Water extraction. Buildings. Bathrooms. Parking lots. Campgrounds. Waste disposal facilities. How can this be done to the same exacting standards required of the Hollister Ranch residents by regulators including the Coastal Commission? Probably it cannot.

The people who live there shouldn't be steamrollered either. Their quality of life will with certainty be quite severely diminished. Great collective effort, discipline and expense were

required to bring the place to its current exemplary state. Is that to be now taken away and harvested in an aggressive fashion and exploited so that anybody on a whim can easily enjoy a novel place to picnic on the beach or take a moody walk? So that surfers can with small effort get to some formerly less crowded than average waves? That would not be a good way to treat the people who have found a way to live in a place without destroying it.

The best, least expensive and most practical approach to preserving this outstanding place is to keep access the way it is now. This is a no cost option to the taxpayer. It is a proven success. Geography has already placed natural barriers to casual coastal visitation, as is the case for most of the coast anyway. The public can and will always be able to access the beach to the extent required by law. But it does now take some effort, some knowledge, some skill and real desire. Which is good.

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Ted Simmons <tedsimmonssb@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 12:11 PM
To: Coastal Hollitser
Subject: Hollister Ranch managed access

How can you develop a program based on the YMCA campground that doesn't exist?

Thank you.

Ted Simmons
tedsimmonssb@gmail.com

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Rich Everett <everettfamilyfarm@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 1:16 PM
To: Coastal Hollister
Cc: Everett Rich
Subject: Hollister Ranch Input

Dear Coastal Commissioners:

First of all I want to thank you for all your work involving our coast line, we really appreciate much of what you are accomplishing.

My wife and I are multigenerational California's and as lifelong sailors, heavily involved with agriculture and livestock, and as the past President of West Marine who spearheaded coastal fishing preservation (started the safe fish to eat campaign which is now world wide) amongst many other coastal and ocean environmental campaigns we deeply care and work to preserve what we have left on our coast and throughout California. We are into sensible preservation, public access, development and business when it makes good common sense.

We have followed the Martins Beach, Privates Beach, and Hollister Ranch public access conversations closely.

One of our farms is in Santa Cruz County, near the coast with a river running through it that drops into the ocean. We are about 5 miles from the Privates beach gate which our family frequently uses. We've boated off the west coast of California as well as Point Conception and Santa Barbara on many occasions.

We want to summarize and relay a story about our hometown and a property just off the famous Steamers Lane lighthouse point in Santa Cruz. The Coastal Commission along with the State decided they no longer approved of the city running Lighthouse Park so the state was given the authority and took it over. Within a short time the park started to become a less and less desirable place to bring our families and our 3 kids who attended a school right across the street could not even go there due to the lack of maintenance, illegal camping, garbage, and drugs which quickly inhabited the park. Then one of the head of California State Parks came out publicly stating that the state did not have the funds to operate or manage the park and ask for the city to take it back over. Today, years later it remains a mess.

I can see the same thing happening with Privates Beach and the Hollister Ranch coastline. Both have had decades and decades of operating well, two of the best results with the environment and at the same time allowing for use. In both cases it is our private citizens, those that live nearby, are parts of that community that know what is best for the good of both the environment and the public. As hard as that is to understand, we can not over emphasize enough that the local communities know what's best and can do the best job in operating their area's.

Regarding the Bixby and Hollister Ranch coastlines, we boated and anchored off their for over 25 years, the coastline, fishing, and kelp beds are a treasure worth protecting. We strongly believe the people living there know how to protect the coastline, the ranchers know how to protect and utilize the grazing land as we have observed over the decades of being offshore that it is "not" over grazed like most ranches these days throughout the U.S.!

We've camped at Gaviota State Park, we know it has always been a run down while the weather is often windy, cold, and the beach is full of dried smelly kelp with very little desire from the public for use. Just a short drive

south brings the public to two more accessible with better weather and coastlines then the northern direction we are addressing. Why? The locals and knowledgeable public understand that the beaches and coastline around Pt Conception are prone to quickly changing weather patterns, rough seas and currents, while the coastline itself is sensitive to increased public use and business development. The knowledgeable public understand, there are plenty of hiking trails around that area currently with little use, plus even if you were to hike in the area, certainly Vandenberg Air Force Base is not going to let anyone cross their area, the coast line is a dead end there.

Let the public utilize Jalama State Beach to the North and Refugio's and El Cap to the South. The state can manage those area's and provide necessary utilization of our coastline with easier public access.

Where would the state get the resources to open up more coastline in possibly the most sensitive & remote coastline in the state? The writing is on the wall, just take a walk through Lighthouse Point park in Santa Cruz, I'll escort you!

Finally the geography of the area (unlike many coastal area's of California) poses huge challenges and practical limits of access to the Hollister Ranch and must be responsibly addressed, especially with regard to the lack of infrastructure, little or no services, challenging topography, sensitive habitat, a fast moving railroad, and to mention again, a often treacherous coastline and extreme winds that can blow off shore, pushing novice beach goers out in the open ocean. This is not Huntington Beach or Malibu! This is a dangerous coastal area to enjoy water activities, the cliffs are steep, and I can think of thousands of better places to take a pleasant hike.

Help protect the Hollister Ranch coastline! Let the coastal environment thrive as it has while managing the public access in a responsible way.

Thank you again for giving us the opportunity to comment.

Rich, Laura, Hailey, Hannah, and Annie Everett

Everett Family Farm
Soquel Cider

"Fine Organics From Seed to Core"

PO Box 308
Soquel, Ca. 95073
831 566 0472
EverettFamilyFarm@comcast.net

From: Zachary Cantor <zmccantor@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 1:47 PM
To: Coastal Hollister
Subject: Hollister Ranch Public Access Program

To whom it may concern:

I currently live in Santa Barbara, and have travelled to Hollister Ranch with friends and family. I am not an owner, but am very concerned about the apparently impulsive, ill-considered and vague plan proposed by AB 2534. It is a sacred, pristine stretch of land, which has been thoughtfully cared for by Hollister Ranch owners for decades. It provides critical environmental preservation for use in scientific studies and for educational purposes--with school children commonly being able to access the property and see one of California's last pristine stretches of coastline.

While I recognize that public access to the California Coast is important, there must be a balance with environmental preservation, tax payer expense and also property ownership rights. My concern is mainly for the environmental preservation, and also with the amount of tax payer dollars that will inevitably be wasted on future litigation and the massive resources required to implement the AB 2534 plan--and that could be better spent on more pressing issues affecting areas and issues closer to where more California residents reside, i.e. infrastructure, water resources, more environmental protection, alternative/sustainable energy production.

First, AB 2534 attempted to implement an outdated plan from 1982, when all of the above-mentioned issues were not nearly as critical as today. The plan clearly needs to be updated, and take into account the priorities most Californian's face today. The plan also did not seem to involve input for implementation from Hollister Ranch owners, which seems odd considering they have been responsibly maintaining the land for decades.

Second, and in this regard, the plan's massive expansion of Gaviota State Park would require an enormous amount of expensive, contentious and complex trail and road easement access of private property--and makes no accounting of the potential costs to California's tax payers. The land acquisition cost alone would be huge. Moreover, the costs in maintaining such an expanded swath of coastline to include trash, water, sewage, security, safety, transportation, trail and road maintenance seems not to have been considered--and certainly no cost estimates have been submitted. Indeed, the resources necessary to accommodate and maintain such infrastructure without permanently damaging this pristine coastline would be enormous. The costs should be reasonable and affordable over the long term, especially ongoing operations and maintenance, which are needed in perpetuity. The responsible public entities (State Parks, County Sheriff, County Fire) already face significant operations, maintenance, and public safety challenges for this

part of the coast. The updated program should honestly and responsibly address the substantial cost and logistical burdens remote Hollister Ranch access would place on these agencies.

Third, given the proposed number of potential visitors mentioned in the plan, it seems naive to assume that almost a half-million additional visitors to this pristine landscape would not have a permanent and devastating affect on the conservation efforts. Indeed, the plan proposes activities and access that not even the current owners permit for themselves, e.g. overnight camping.

Finally, safety is not accounted for. The plan has not accounted for and does not appear to have even done surveys necessary to assess the fact that the landscape is extremely hilly and remote. The proposed infrastructure would be quite complex to implement--and would only drive up an already extremely expensive undertaking. The plan, therefore, pays no attention to the safety hazards inherently present.

Thank you for your thoughtful and diligent consideration of this important issue.

- Zachary Cantor

--
Zachary M. Cantor, Esq.
1112 Montana Ave., Ste. C
Santa Monica, CA 90403
Office: (213) 674-0325
Cantorlawyers.com

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Greg Linder <carmelgreg@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 1:48 PM
To: Coastal.Hollitser
Cc: carmelgbl@aol.com
Subject: Hollister Ranch Access Issue

December 10, 2018

To: California Coastal Commission
From: Greg Linder
POB 7214
Carmel, CA 93921

Dear Coastal Commissioners,

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the subject of Hollister Ranch public access.

I am a third generation Californian and a surfer for 50 plus years. I have surfed all around the globe and have lived on the Central Coast of California since the 1970's and have surfed the whole coast of California for decades.

One of my favorite places to surf is the Hollister Ranch. What makes it so special among other things is that being there is like stepping back in time when the California coast was largely untouched by the hand of man. From just north of Gaviota St. Park all the way to Vandenberg Air Force Base the California coast is just about as pristine as it was in the 1800's. It is so quiet there that the sea life and the sand pipers thrive there and don't have to compete for there natural habitat with beach-going crowds.

Having surfed or visited almost the entire coast of California I know the specialness of the Hollister Ranch will be unalterably and negatively affected by public access.

My feeling is that myself and others, can already access the Hollister Ranch via boat and I have even walked to the beaches of the Hollister Ranch along the shore. Taking a little bit of work adds to the joy of finding an uncrowded natural setting unsullied by "civilization" as found everywhere else in our crowded State.

So dear Commissioners and Staff thank you for your careful consideration of this issue. After thinking about this long and hard it is my feeling and hopefully yours that keeping access to the Hollister Ranch as it has been and not changing it to public access is the best thing for all concerned. After all it only takes a bit of work via walking in along the shore or using a boat and upon arrival you find yourself in a truly special place untrammelled as all other Southern California beaches are.

Sincerely,

Greg Linder
P.O. Box 7214
Carmel, CA 93921

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Alex Harleen <alexharleen@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 1:51 PM
To: Coastal Hollister
Subject: In regards to 1982 Hollister Ranch Public Access Program

Dear Members of the California Coastal Commission,

I am writing today as a resident of San Francisco, an avid surfer, and as someone who extensively uses and enjoys California's beaches and coastline. Through my love of backpacking, surfing, hiking and trail running I have become intensely interested in the issue of public access to outdoor spaces.

The redevelopment of the 1982 Hollister Ranch Public Access Program is incredibly important, and I appreciate your willingness to take public comment. As California residents, we are afforded the incredible gift and responsibility of having access to raw and natural spaces. The coastline is a limited resource, and I believe it is our duty to be judicious in how we use it. A part of that is ensuring that there are places on the coastline that everyone can access and enjoy (much like how Yosemite valley gives everyone the chance to experience the High Sierras). However, I have been to Yosemite Valley, and we would ruin the Sierras if every part of the range had the same development and infrastructure as the valley.

In California, we enjoy incredible access to the coastline. Last weekend I surfed at Fort Cronkhite, and you can drive right up to the break and park. And up and down the coast there are countless spots just like Cronkhite. But when you're out there, you can't help but consider what it looked like before there were the giant parking lots, the fences, the bathrooms and the metal signs. When the indications of human presence were limited instead of omnipresent. Of those lightly trodden places, on our California coast, there's not too many left. And I believe the Hollister Ranch coastline is one of those rare places.

At this point in California's history, preservation of the coastline is more important than development and access.

I strongly urge the commission to limit the scope of the new plan.

Respectfully,

Alex Harleen

--
Alex Harleen
Kynetic Consulting
(510) 282-6970
AlexHarleen@gmail.com

From: Jan Rutkin Ostendorf [<mailto:jan@toddrutkin.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, November 14, 2018 2:50 PM
To: EnvironmentalJustice@Coastal
Subject: Public comment

To Whom it May Concern:

I realize I have missed the deadline for public comment on the CCC Environmental Justice policy, however, I would respectfully ask that you consider & accept my comments in light of the fires & emergency situations that have occurred in the last week near my area. There are 2 projects for which I would like to submit comments:

1) HOLLISTER RANCH:

I would like to say that the CCC decisions with respect to Hollister Ranch are outrageous. There are over 8 miles of public beach that the public is being denied access to because a few very wealthy property owners in the area have hired lobbyists to prevent access. Steve Lopez (LA Times columnist said it best - (I am paraphrasing):

"The only way to get in & out of Hollister Ranch is via kayak. You can kayak and the following might happen:

- you could become shark bait
- you could end up on one of the outer islands
- you could drown
- you might make it, but then you have to get back. ..

However, if you happen to have a helicopter, you can fly in and land it - there is a helicopter pad. Lastly, if you happen to be part of a school group, you can go there once a year."

I think that just about says it all. Please explain to me how is it that Yvon Chinard (Mr. Environmental Patagonia), James Cameron (Mr. Titanic) and several other wealthy individuals get to keep Hollister Ranch private - with basically no public access? Furthermore, these same wealthy individuals are getting a property tax break because they are supposedly part of a "Ranch." Trust me, Yvon Chinard & James Cameron do not do any ranching at Hollister Ranch. Wouldn't we all like a property tax break? But then, you have to be part of a ranch. I think you have to have cows too. Steve Lopez wrote a column about this too.

2) I was present at the CCC meeting in Scott's Valley on July 11, 2018 when the commissioners rubber stamped the eldercare development at 1525 Palisades Drive, Pacific Palisades, CA 90272. It was a complete travesty! In case you missed it, the developer is planning to build an eldercare facility for 90+ eldercare residents in the Pacific Palisades Highlands. This was erroneously approved by City of LA & this project violates the CA Coastal Act in multiple ways - And then, to add insult to injury, the CCC approved it!!!

The City of LA and the CA Coastal Commission should not have approved this project as it violates the CA Coastal Act in 5 specific ways:

1) • No traffic study or analysis of traffic impacts on public access – violates 30250, 30252 CA COASTAL ACT

2) • No analysis of view impacts, no story poles erected, City claimed views not relevant since only view that "counts" is ocean view- violates 30251 CA COASTAL ACT – (Mountain views in the CA Coastal Zone are protected)

3) • Insufficient/incorrect data on parking; did not consider visitors, employees, independent medical care providers and impact on access to parks : Violates 30252 CA COASTAL ACT

4) • No analysis of impact of brush clearing on parkland- Violates 30240 CA COASTAL ACT (Would significantly impact the adjacent riparian creek and Sycamore – Oak woodland in Santa Ynez Canyon Park).

5) • Failure to analyze consistency with Interpretive Guidelines- 30620(3) CA COASTAL ACT

(Consistency with respect to the other buildings in the area which are 2 story - this project would be 4 story 64,646 sq ft - oversized & massive - Inconsistent with the neighborhood.)

AND YOU CALL THIS ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE???

Now, in light of the still raging fires in California, are you really going to tell me it makes sense to put a 64,646 sq ft eldercare project with 90+ eldercare individuals up in the Santa Monica Mountains? It's completely ludicrous! Can you imagine evacuating all of them, many of them disabled (or not independent, hence they are in an eldercare facility) + staff + all the people who live in the Palisades Highlands (approximately 3,000) in the middle of a firestorm? Also, the City of LA's own guidelines for eldercare facilities are that they are to be "centrally located," and close to medical resources. This site is no where near any medical resources! It's 20 minutes from the nearest hospital without any traffic, 40 minutes with traffic and 90+ minutes in the middle of an emergency situation. Please tell me where is the logic or the "environmental justice"? But the CCC approved this project without even discussing it!

I'm a 3rd generation Californian and it seems to me that the CCC used to always do the right thing in protecting and preserving our CA Coastal Zone for us and future generations. That's why it was created. Now, it seems very inconsistent. If we don't protect the coastal zone NOW, we will lose it to irresponsible developers who are

only in it for the money. And/ or, we will lose public access altogether because we don't have the money to fight for it and it will only be accessible to the super wealthy.

I am writing as an individual, not representing anyone but myself. Although I realize that CCC decisions are final - I really wish they would reconsider their decisions on the above 2 situations. They are just wrong, environmentally & otherwise.

I copied the following from the CCC website:

"The California Coastal Commission is committed to protecting and enhancing California's coast and ocean for present and future generations. It does so through careful planning and regulation of environmentally-sustainable development, rigorous use of science, strong public participation, education, and effective intergovernmental coordination."

As a citizen of CALIFORNIA, I just want the CCC to do what it says it is committed to doing- and that's not happening.

Please confirm receipt of my comments.

Jan Rutkin Ostendorf

Jan Rutkin Ostendorf
jan@toddrutkin.com
323-422-4146

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Grant Fowlie <GFowlie@brushresearch.com>
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 3:04 PM
To: Coastal Hollister
Subject: Hollister Ranch Public Access

To the California Coastal Commission,

Thank you for your efforts on behalf of the state and in working to protect, conserve, restore and enhance the environment of the California coastline. It is one of the things I am most passionate about in life, having been born and raised in Southern California and spending time along the water from San Diego to Pismo.

I am fortunate enough to be a part owner now. My parents worked to purchase an empty parcel in the 80s. Over the many years since we've spent considerable time and money invested into the Ranch as it is something that we believe in deeply. We are not movie stars or famous directors-just Californians who value a natural coastline and the untouched beauty of the Ranch. What makes it so powerful and special in the world is precisely what is at risk now. The morning walks at low tide to explore the tide pools would be no more. One need only to look up and down the coast, whether completely open to the public or managed through the State Park system to see that to be true. Pristine natural coasts with endangered species have given way to garbage strewn areas and parking lots.

Essentially, we would be destroying this small area of beauty to create another couple miles of the same. There is no upside, and all of the downside.

You have it in your power to not only stand by your mission of protecting and conserving our coastline but also to follow the legal directions of the governor when he vetoed AB 2534. You have it in your power to allow the principle stakeholder and landowner, The Hollister Ranch, to be included in the process of looking at the changes of the 26 year old program, which is deeply flawed. We know there is no YMCA camp ever built. We know there are no public roads and that the fiscal cost and environmental cost of adding trails and roads across sensitive and private land would be extraordinary. We know how hard it is already to manage the small Gaviota State Park. This would take that cost and multiply it by a factor of a thousand after all of the trail/road work is completed.

I can tell you from first hand experience that the impact on the beaches is apparent when even 10 people are there and don't clean up thoroughly. I can guarantee that what exists would be ruined from the 100,000s of visitors that would end up against these bluffs and on the reefs.

Our small roads are already dangerous with small passenger vehicles, these are not meant to be throughways for large vehicles or many tourists. There is no mobile phone service, no lifeguards, no police, no camping allowed, etc.

This is a chance for you to stand up for the coast, for nature and for the law.

I deeply and sincerely appreciate you taking the time to read through the thoughts of a regular person who has the chance to see what would be destroyed. I work 9 to 5 just like anyone else, I am not an elitist enemy of the people. I share the ranch with as many people as possible, I do not surf. I'm not trying to protect a surf break or something like that. I am concerned with the destruction of something that is deeply important to me.

Very best regards,
Grant Fowlie

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Rory Shevin <roryshevin@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 3:41 PM
To: Coastal Hollister
Subject: Public Access-Hollister Ranch

Dear Coastal Commission members,

Thank you for your service on behalf of all Californians.

I am Rory Shevin. I live in Calabasas and am a recently retired Real Estate Broker after 40+ years in the business.

I voted for the Coastal act in 1972. I am a firm believer in the protecting the wondrous public spaces that we have in California thru controlled access from Yosemite to various beach campgrounds. And I am in favor of the protection of these public treasures through controlled public access. I feel Hollister Ranch is just such a treasure and deserves controlled public access to protect and maintain it.

I am currently an owner at the Hollister Ranch. As such I am not opposed to public access in a controlled manner in ways that I think this body would appreciate.

First of all, I believe we already have a level of public access to the Hollister Ranch from being the adjoining land owner to Gaviota State Park. In fact, I used to boat from the Gaviota pier into the ranch back in 1970 long before I had the ability to become an owner. And now while at the ranch, I always see fishing boats, sea urchin & lobster boats, and surfing boats in the water along the coast. I see fisherman walking into the ranch along with campers and surfers as well. It is important to note that the HR has never built any type of barrier to the public. No walls, no fences, no structures that prevent access along the coastal beaches, things like it is more common to see along PCH in the Malibu coast for example where building a home and putting up a fence makes access impossible. Yes the Ranch built roads on their private property back when the ranch was subdivided in 1970. And yes the ranch even built a guard house to limit people from wandering onto private property. These private amenities are on private property which is a concept I still think we believe in, in this country. The real barriers to a more widespread access are only the natural barriers that exist in this part of California. The mountains, the cliffs, the steep terrain, the rocky shoreline. These are not barriers the Hollister Ranch has placed but nothing more than natural terrain that exists in this part of the coast. In my view, the public is welcome to walk, bike, boat and other wise use the coast which is and should be open to everyones use.

It has been my experience in working with this body that the stated goal of the Coastal commission is to limit the building and development along the coast. As a point in fact, when I became an owner at the ranch in the mid 1980's and later on, I tried to build a very small and modest home (appx. 3,000 ft) on my 108 acre parcel which is located apx. 1.25 miles inland from the coast, and not visible from the coast. While my plans were approved by both the ranch HOA and the county of Santa Barbara, I was repeatedly rejected by the CC who did not want development there. It took me over 7 years of struggle with this body to finally get the approval to build my small home, for which I am eternally thankful for.

Yet contrary to the stated goals of this body to limit development along the coast, I am learning the CC is looking to put roads, trails, parking lots, bathrooms facilities, lifeguard towers, buses, unlimited access and use of this very fragile

ecosystem with dangerous eroding cliffs, coastal creeks blending into mature Oak forests, wild animals who make this their home, bobcats, mountain lions, wild pigs, rare tide pools, pristine unspoiled coastline with wild habitat frequented by whales, dolphins, an occasional sea lion, otters. All this on our private property and not to mention the ranch is a working cattle ranch with cattle and babies calves wandering the landscape.

It would seem to me that this body would be in favor of limiting the development of such a pristine resource. Certainly this seems to be the CC goal when confronted with each private landowner's proposal to build on their land; this body always has and still is currently fighting to stop any development. How does that square with this new proposal to develop in a way that will certainly destroy such a pristine and valuable resource.

Thank you for considering my input.

Rory Shevin
roryshevin@gmail.com

--

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Laura Francis <laura.a.francis@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 3:41 PM
To: Coastal.Hollitser
Subject: Hollister Ranch Access Plan

Dear Commissioners,

I live in Santa Barbara and I am a marine biologist, educator, conservationist working on the Southern California Coast and Channel Islands for the past 24 years. I think it is incredibly important for us to preserve the stretch of coast in Hollister Ranch that exemplifies California as it once was before intense urbanization. In my opinion, the 1982 HR plan (that was never implemented) needs to be re-done thoughtfully and completely and I recommend that the Commission follow the direction provided by Governor Brown in his veto of AB 2534 to develop a new comprehensive plan for that stretch of coast. I understand that the Commission has proposed an interagency working group made up of the State Lands Commission, Coastal Conservancy, State Parks and the Coastal Commission to update the 1982 plan. To me, it would make a lot of sense for the primary landowner (that has been responsible for conservation and stewardship for the area for many years), Hollister Ranch, should be included in this process.

Some questions that I would like to see answered by the Commission are: How do you propose to provide more access to this area but also protect sensitive coastal resources? How would you propose implementing an access program on a private, 14,500 acre working cattle ranch? Additionally, how would you address the fact that this area has no public roads, has limited communication and emergency services, and no public utilities? There is already significant existing and planned managed access programs that focus on underserved and special needs populations. I think focusing on these kinds of carefully managed programs will help to keep this jewel of our coastline intact and responsibly managed for the future.

Thanks for the hard work that you do to take care of our fragile coastal resources.

best regards,
Laura Francis

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Gary Groth-Marnat <GGroth-Marnat@pacific.edu>
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 4:46 PM
To: Coastal Hollister
Subject: Hollister Ranch

December 10, 2018

RE: Hollister Ranch

Dear Members of the Coastal Commission,

My name is Gary Groth-Marnat and I have closely followed the debates and processes related to greater public access to the Hollister Ranch. Accordingly, I'm concerned with the practicality of implementing public access and have the following questions:

How could the plan be reasonably implemented given the sensitive habitat, absence of infrastructure, nonexistent services, danger associated with railroad crossings, trespassing onto railroad property, need to protect ongoing cattle ranching (14,500 acres), challenging topography, private property rights, legal liabilities (injuries, etc.), and policing the rights of landowners.

I understand that the 1982 program was considered outdated by Governor Brown and, as a result, he did not sign necessary legislation to proceed. Given the above questions, I think it's essential that any newly proposed plan should not be a brief makeover. Instead, it should carefully and clearly address the above issues. This should also include a realistic and credible cost for the complete public access package.

I look forward to the above issues being discussed and answered.

Sincerely,

Gary Groth-Marnat

From: greta meaney <gretameaney@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 4:51 PM
To: Coastal.Hollister
Subject: Hollister Ranch Access Plan

TO: California Coastal Commission
FROM: Greta Meaney
Former YMCA Board of Directors
Carpinteria, CA
RE: Hollister Ranch Access Plan

As a former board member for the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) from 1964-1983, there are some important information included in the 1982 Hollister Ranch Access Plan with regards to the YMCA and Hollister Ranch that requires correction.

1. The YMCA proposed camp was never built. This can not be overstated.
2. The Conditional Use Permit and associated conditions have expired.
3. Operations of a remote recreational facilities/trails such as at Hollister Ranch is costly. During my tenure on the YMCA Board we chose to focus resources towards the construction and operations of YMCA facilities in Lompoc and Santa Ynez. This decision allowed for a much greater public benefit.

An important question that the Coastal Commissioners should ask themselves prior to expanding recreational opportunities is “are our existing recreational areas receiving the maximum stewardship and management potential serving the best interest to the public.” I don’t believe that to be the case. I do not support additional recreational facilities/trails in Gaviota as I don’t believe the State’s existing recreational resources are getting the attention they need and deserve.

Sincerely,

Greta Meaney

From: Colton Sarlo <colton.sar@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 5:43 PM
To: Coastal Hollister
Subject: population increase equals increase in pollution

My Name is Colton Sarlo and I am a new resident to The Hollister Ranch. I was born and raised in Malibu, California and as a surfer in the Los Angeles area I have seen the direct environmental relationship between population density in coastal regions to increase in pollution. I have not only seen the effect of pollution due to population increase in my home town, also in some of California's greatest natural treasures, such as Yosemite.

Yosemite, has had an increase in park visitors from roughly about 3.8 million visitors per year in 2013, to roughly 5.2 million visitors per year in 2016, based on recent data from (<https://www.nps.gov/yose/learn/management/statistics.htm>)

With the population increase in/ to Yosemite, the pollution levels follow, also crime of defaces some of its natural land makes as well.

<https://www.nps.gov/articles/airprofiles-yose.htm>

In 2014, we see how population increase to Yosemite lead to graffiti in some of California's greatest natural land marks.

<https://www.sfgate.com/bayarea/article/Feds-hunt-clueless-graffiti-artist-in-5843498.php>

Simply said, it is preposterous to believe that opening Hollister Ranch, an environmentally private area to the public will benefit the environment at all. This will only lead to more pollution and devastation to the natural habitat.

From: scott putnam <sbripman@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 6:16 PM
To: Coastal Hollister
Subject: Update of 1982 Hollister Ranch Public Access Program

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen:

It is my understanding that the Coastal Commission is asking for suggestions as to what a new "sensible and fiscally responsible" plan for Hollister Ranch might look like.

I have been an owner of a home at Hollister Ranch since the early 90's and my perspective on the issue is shaped by that experience.

My comments are as follows:

1. The Hollister Ranch is subject to climate extremes including tremendous dryness and harsh winds, much of the time. This makes it an extremely hazardous place for anyone not familiar with its micro-climate. Any new access program should take this into account.
2. During wind events (and at other times) the wildfire risk can be extreme, and access to many parts of Hollister Ranch, and neighboring ranches, for firefighters and other responders, can be problematic.
3. In recent days we have learned that endangered mountain lions were injured and/or killed in the Woolsey fire. A wildfire at Hollister Ranch would likely do significant damage to endangered or threatened species.
4. Humankind is eradicating most species on earth other than human-dependent animals such as cows, chickens, pigs, dogs and housecats. Any new plan for Hollister Ranch should take extraordinary care to ensure protection of the unique species currently living there.
5. Given the world-wide environmental and species crisis, any plan for Hollister Ranch should err on the side of preserving the wilderness and preventing possible species loss.
6. The shoreline at Hollister Ranch contains excellent habitat for inter-tidal species and unsupervised public access could result in significant predation of the habitat (rock and shell collection, for example, has decimated much of the coast in the greater Los Angeles area).
7. Recreational beach activities at Hollister Ranch are fraught with risk. There are submerged and jagged rocks in the surf zone, and waves can be large and powerful. A number of deaths and injuries have occurred there over the years.
8. The current managed access program provided by the Hollister Ranch Owners Association (the "HR Program") is an excellent means of dealing with the issues described above. It is recommended that the HR Program is the most sensible and most fiscally responsible program that can be devised, and should be continued as currently constituted.
9. If there were unsupervised visitors pursuant to a new access program, new guides and lifeguards and fire personnel and docents and medical personnel could be necessary. Otherwise the risk of deaths and major environmental damage would be high. Consequently any additional state access program would need to have substantial funding for these purposes. This may not be fiscally responsible given other needs for public funds.
10. Limited human use of the coast between Gaviota and Jalama is one of its most unique assets. The area has only become more special since 1982 because of the level of preservation that has occurred as compared to beaches throughout the rest of Southern California and the Central Coast. Any new program should go to great lengths to protect the significant coastal resources that result from it.
11. These are my personal views. I do not speak for other owners at the Hollister Ranch, or for the owners' association there. But I believe that other owners share my concern that an expanded public access program, without the type of management that the HR Program provides, could result in widespread and lasting damage. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment.

Scott Putnam

18 Hollister Ranch

Gaviota, CA 93117

From: Cliff Scholte <cliff_scholte@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 6:19 PM
To: Coastal Hollitser
Subject: Comments on the 1982 Hollister Ranch Public Access Program

Dear Commissioners:

I have been a resident of Santa Barbara County for 53 years. I was employed as an environmental scientist for over 30 years, working in both the public and private sectors. As a result, I am familiar with issues surrounding the maintenance and protection of environmental resources, as well as the challenges to the State in performing their required duties.

I have frequented the open spaces west of Santa Barbara, now referred to as the Gaviota Coast, hiking on beaches and in canyons for many years. I've launched a skiff from Gaviota State Park hundreds of times so I could surf and fish off the coast of both the Hollister and Bixby Ranches. I have been awed by the incredible beauty and remoteness of the area, and I would like my children to enjoy the same experience.

Furthermore, I have been aware of the public access issues surrounding the Hollister Ranch dating back to the plan developed by the CCC in 1982. Due to my long association with this beautiful stretch of coast and my appreciation of it, I am interested in preserving the natural state of this area. I present these comments and questions in that light.

I agree with Governor Brown's decision to veto AB 2534, as the 1982 plan is outdated and doesn't make sense more than 30 years after it was developed. I agree with him that a new "sensible and fiscally responsible" plan be developed. The 1982 plan is full of flaws, e.g., it assumes the State has the fiscal resources to operate and maintain the proposed action without providing credible documentation how this would be accomplished; it assumes the existence of an in-place YMCA camp; it assumes the construction of costly and contentious trail and road easements across private land; it ignores the extensive developmental and safety challenges that would be required for public access. In short, the 1982 plan, as is, is not a reasonably feasible proposal.

If the CCC is to move forward with public access to the Hollister Ranch, the 1982 plan needs to be completely revamped. A quick and dirty fix is not acceptable, as the project is complicated and will be expensive. Please consider that the access is proposed to be maintained forever. It doesn't take much to see this will be a huge and problematic undertaking, and it deserves a substantial effort to develop a plan that will work.

Before one considers the impact of the people accessing the area, one must consider the impacts of the development itself. Consider the physical challenges related to the topography, the impacts to sensitive habitat, the rights of the private property owners (and railroad). How will these be addressed? Then, of course, once the public enters the picture, what will be the prolonged impacts to environmental resources and how will these be managed?

Without extending this email too much more, I pose a few more questions for the Commissioners:

1. - How does the Commission propose to address the physical challenges, as well as the lack of infrastructure, considering there are no public utilities, public roads, emergency services, sanitary facilities, limited land-line and cell service, etc.?

2. - How does the Commission propose to allow access and at the same time protect the sensitive habitat and resources?
3. - How does the Commission propose to protect the private property rights of the individuals at Hollister Ranch?
4. - How does the Commission propose to fund and manage the program in perpetuity, especially considering the challenges to State agency workload and budget?
5. - Has the Commission considered allowing a representative from the private landowners at the Hollister Ranch to participate in the development of the new plan?

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on this issue. I ask that you please consider the unique aspects of this part of California coastline and that you, above all, protect the resources in this area.

Best regards,

Cliff Scholle

From: Douglas Imperato <dpi@gte.net>
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 7:33 PM
To: Coastal Hollister
Subject: Preserve the Hollister Ranch- maintain the current level of public access!

Commissioners,

I have lived, surfed and enjoyed the beautiful coast of Santa Barbara County for more than 30 years. I have raised my two children here and they have similarly grown up with a deep appreciation for the natural beauty of this coastline.

For many years, I regularly accessed the Hollister Ranch walking along the beach, by boat, and as guests of friendly ranch owners. We are deeply disturbed by the recent increase in efforts by the Coastal Commission, the media, and a few very vocal "outsiders" who are pursuing increased access at the Ranch. I have developed close ties with many of the local surf community and I know just one person who is in favor increasing public access.

When Governor Brown vetoed AB 2543, he indicated that the 1982 public access program was outdated and needed to be updated. It is our feeling that most of the aspects of that program are completely unacceptable. This document needs a complete and total re-write and it is imperative that the Hollister Ranch ownership be involved in this process.

The problems with the 1982 program are numerous. How would the Coastal Commission propose implementing access to this working cattle ranch that has no public roads? The current road system is owned and maintained by the Owners and is barely adequate to accommodate the 1200 Ranch owners. How would the Commission pay the enormous costs to build and maintain trail and road easements across private parcels? What will be the impact to this pristine environment of the additional tens or hundreds of thousands of additional guests that are envisioned? What about the enormous costs and huge environmental impact of building and maintaining the supporting facilities for the huge increase in additional users? Any additional development to accommodate large numbers of the public at the Ranch will have an especially large and detrimental impact to wildlife and habitat. The physical challenges and practical limits of access to the Ranch should responsibly address the absence of infrastructure and services, steep and rugged terrain, abundance of sensitive habitat, the railroad, and private property rights and interests.

I urge the Commission not to force the transformation of the Ranch to just another crowded, developed, southern California beach. It has remained in a pristine state through the careful stewardship of the owners. Dramatically increasing public access at the Ranch will have an enormous negative impact on the coastal environment, is not logistically practical, and will be extremely expensive. There are many other places along the California coast that do not have these challenges, the Commission should focus their access efforts in those areas.

Thank you.

Douglas Imperato, Ph.D.
2543 Mesa School Lane
Santa Barbara, CA 93109
805.570.0433

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Tina Borden <tina_borden@mac.com>
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 8:28 PM
To: Coastal Hollitser
Subject: 12/14 Meeting: Questions

After reading through the Hollister Ranch Access Program Overview prior to the meeting on December 14th, 2018, I have a few questions:

1. Who is going to pay for this? Not only will it be costly to build out this plan (facilities, roads, trails, etc.) but the on-going maintenance tab will be exorbitant.
2. What authorization is required to build/use roads/trails across private property?
3. Will the state be required to seize private property in order to implement this plan? If yes, what is the estimated cost to do so?

Thank you for your time and consideration to these questions.

Tina Borden

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: jesse wooten <jwooten34@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 4:29 AM
To: Coastal Hollister
Subject: Public Access

Dear Coastal Commission,

My name is Jesse Wooten. I'm an environmentalist, educator, and surfer in Santa Barbara, CA, and am writing to express concerns regarding the updating of the 1982 public access plan to Hollister Ranch.

First, given that the plan is almost 40 years old, it needs a major overhaul in terms of the usage and planned access, not just some tweaking here or there. Governor Brown realized this and that is why he vetoed the bill recently.

Second, in order to make any positive change, it makes sense that the Hollister Ranch Owners Association be included and consulted throughout the process of developing the plan.

That stretch of coast is our last remnant of pristine Southern California coastline, and it's important that it's development be carefully considered and reconsidered as we move forward.

Thank you for reading.

Jesse Wooten
Santa Barbara, CA

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Bill Borden <wpborden@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 7:18 AM
To: Coastal Hollister
Subject: Hollister Ranch (HR) 1982 Plan

Dear Commission - I am a lifelong resident and taxpayer in California, having spent all of my childhood and a good portion of my adult life in/near Santa Barbara. I am also passionate about environmental issues, especially those that impact our California coastline.

Regarding the 1982 Plan, I am very interested to understand:

- Who specifically will benefit from implementation of the Plan?
- What will be the cost to implement and maintain that Plan? What was the estimated cost when this plan was originally created in the early 80's?
- And before that, what will even be the cost to fully update and modernize the 1982 Plan?...it is over 35 years old and much has changed since it was originally contemplated.
- How will the voting public be made aware of these costs prior to pushing forward with The Plan? Who will decide if this is a budgeting priority versus all of the other challenges facing the state and it's residents?
- In addition to the financial costs, how should we analyze/assess the environmental costs? Based on my reading of the Plan, the environmental costs could be meaningful, although harder to quantify than the financial costs.

I think that The Plan should remain on hold until all the costs associated with 1) fully updating and then 2) implementing and 3) maintaining The Plan are better understood by CA taxpayers. Only then can a proper cost benefit analysis be prepared and analyzed. Thank you very much.

Bill Borden

Sent from my iPhone

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Kit <recycledhouse@fastmail.us>
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 7:34 AM
To: Coastal Hollitser
Subject: 1982 Hollister Ranch Public Access Program

Dear Commissioners,

There is a fundamental misunderstanding of the public's access to the shoreline adjacent to the Hollister Ranch highlighted by the statement made in the California Coastal Commission's "Informational Report on 1982 Hollister Ranch Public Access Program":

"...the public has never been able to exercise their constitutional right of access to the beaches at Hollister Ranch"

That statement ignores the fact that for decades the public has been using a number of access ways to the coast there:

- 1) By foot along the beach with access from Gaviota State Park.
- 2) By boat from the Gaviota State Park pier and beach, and
- 3) By the Hollister Ranch managed access program for the public.

Additionally, within the 60-mile stretch of California coastline from Pt. Sal to Gaviota, not including Jalama Beach County Park or Surf Beach near Lompoc, these Hollister Ranch routes provide the most opportunity for the public to use the shoreline. Two thirds of public access to that coastline is restricted by the Federal Government by Vandenberg Air Force base.

It would be a disservice to the citizens of California to spend hundreds of millions of dollars for an adversarial effort to acquire, develop, and maintain new parkland at Hollister Ranch when the State can't afford to repair the storm damaged pier at Gaviota, or keep that Park open during winter months for overnight camping, or improve the approximately 12 miles of State Park owned coastline from Gaviota to El Capitan.

With continued good stewardship one of the last vestiges of untouched California coastline can continue for decades. Please scrap the 1982 plan and work with the Hollister Ranch Owners' Association toward a sensible resolution of this issue.

Thank you for your efforts on behalf of all of us who actively use our beautiful California shoreline.

Sincerely,

Kit Boise-Cossart
Santa Barbara County

From: Michael Ramsey <ecomichael11@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 7:41 AM
To: Coastal Hollister
Subject: Hollister Ranch Public Access Trail

California Coastal Commission Members,

I greatly appreciate you taking the time to read my brief but concise comments regarding public access to Hollister Ranch and it's beaches. I have lived on Hollister Ranch since 2003, and I am still living there full time.

I have participated as a docent in our tide pool school programs for school children to view sensitive sea life at the Alegria reef. Hollister Ranch has also sponsored many other managed access programs to its beaches, Wounded Warriors, Walk on Water and various other groups for sponsored events at the beaches along Hollister Ranch.

The current settlement between the California Coastal Conservancy and the CCC with the HROA provides for even greater amounts of managed access to it's beaches.

The public has access to Hollister Ranch beaches from the mean high tide lines, like all the beaches along our California coast line. As a native Californian and a strong proponent of property rights, I find it offensive and intrusive that the CCC wants to create a public access trail through private property to access the beaches along Hollister Ranch, there are many other coastal locations along the vast California coast line that are not accessible because of cliffs and other topographical constraints.

Hollister Ranch is a working Cattle Ranch and has been for close to 150 years or more, imposing a public access trail through condemnation would be expensive, cumbersome and would jeopardize our Cattle operation and the fragile ecosystem along the cliffs and private property on Hollister Ranch.

Any potential public trail access plans, should include representatives from The Hollister Ranch.

Please also consider the many other coastal beaches that are kept private for various other reasons, Camp Pendleton, Vandenberg Air Force Base, Cojo Jalama/Bixby Ranches are all private and kept in pristine and natural condition without public intrusion to keep the coastal beaches and land preserved without being over run by the vast public.

California needs to protect and preserve what is currently left and undeveloped and kept in a native and in a natural state for generations to come,

Hollister Ranch has a mission statement,.. to: Protect and Preserve our Natural Resources.

Thank you,

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael Ramsey
HR #11

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Locklin, Linda@Coastal
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 8:33 AM
To: Coastal Hollitser
Subject: FW: Public Access to Hollister Ranch

From: Tom tcraig@hearstcastle.com [<mailto:zkahuna51@gmail.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 8:06 AM
To: Ainsworth, John@Coastal; Christie, Sarah@Coastal; Locklin, Linda@Coastal
Subject: Public Access to Hollister Ranch

Dear Coastal Commission,

My name is Thomas Craig. I am a licensed landscape with the State of California and have worked with California State Parks as a Landscape Architect at Hearst Castle for over twenty years. I know what it takes to maintain roads, trails and other infrastructure.

I've been boating into the Hollister Ranch for over fifty years.
My first trip was in 1966 when I fell in love with it's pristine beauty.
The continued stewardship has kept the landscape fairly untouched since the 1960's.

I firmly believe that opening up the Hollister Ranch with trails, restrooms and additional development will ruin the overall beauty of the land and create many environmental concerns.

If California State Parks is involved, they will acquire the land, but look to others to pay for everything. They continue to complain that they don't have the funding to fix the Gaviota Pier, which is one way for the public to access the area.

I've seen how their maintenance programs wither away on existing parks.
The bottom line is they can't take care of what they currently oversee.

Remember, the California Coastal Commission was originally set up to preserve the California coastline and it's surroundings. Please consider upholding this objective.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Thomas Craig
CA Landscape Architect #1792
Cayucos, California

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Locklin, Linda@Coastal
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 8:34 AM
To: Coastal Hollitser
Subject: FW: Save our coastline- just a little jewel!

From: patty Schaefer [<mailto:pattyschaef@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 9:26 PM
To: Locklin, Linda@Coastal
Subject: Fwd: Save our coastline....just a little jewel!

Dear Ms. Locklin,

I live in Northern California and have been witness to the devastation of climate change and overpopulation into our beautiful natural areas of California. I live in Chico and have seen what the crowding of people on our lands have done. The push of humans on to natural lands its wildlife has shown its devastation. It is time protect our beautiful lands.

I have had opportunities to visit the area of Hollister Ranch only a few times over 20 years and I marvel at the beauty that still exists without 'that trampling'. The Ranch has small dirt roads, beautiful oaks, native plants. Cattle roam at ease (across all roads without danger). No pollution or trash on the beaches. Beautiful areas for sea life to thrive, wild deer, pigs, coyotes, and mountain lions exist and are protected.

We have an opportunity to save these lands from being trampled with garbage, heavy road traffic and massive human pressure.

This area needs to stay pristine. If open, only for educational and enviromental opportunitites for people to learn how to appreciate what beauty California can keep....not destroy.

The area is a ranch, the roads are very small and windy and dangerous. The upkeep and rebuilding of infrastructure would be enormous to let massive amounts of people to trample this land.

Please be wise and keep a bit of our sweet coastal wildlife protected and our oceans and land healthy.

Thanks you so sincerely,
Patricia Schaefer
Chico, California

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Jack Wall <jackwall@earthlink.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 8:45 AM
To: Coastal Hollister
Cc: 'Hollister Ranch'
Subject: Hollister Ranch

Dear Coastal Commission

As an owner on the Hollister Ranch, I am writing you in regard to the purposed public access of the Ranch. As a native Californian, we all appreciate access to our beaches. However in the case of the Hollister Ranch, access is very problematic. The Ranch currently has cattle roaming over the main road from the main gate to the west end. Bicycles and pedestrians do not blend well with the cattle operations. There is no infrastructure for the public. There is no potable water available. Water wells would have to be drilled in the back country on private property with pipelines crossing multiple parcels to provide water to the beach areas. There is no sewage/septic systems in place. The nearest public safety resource could be more than 30 minutes away. There is no lifeguard service for those that use the 8 1/2 miles of beaches. Most of the beaches have no cell service. There is no public trash collection. There is no protection from the heavy winds that do occur on a regular basis.

The 1982 Hollister Ranch Public Access Program is completely outdated and does not reflect the true problems with the purposed public access at that time.

I am asking the Coastal Commission and the Coastal Conservancy to accept the initial agreement that was signed between the Ranch and the Commission. It allows limited public access without damaging the sensitive coastal resources.

Thank you for your consideration
Jack Wall

From: Scott Kidd <scottkidd@cox.net>
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 9:08 AM
To: Coastal Hollister
Subject: Hollister Access Concern

Dear Commission and Staff,

In October, Governor Jerry Brown vetoed AB 2534 (Limon), a bill meant to prioritize public access to the Hollister Ranch using an access program adopted by the California Coastal Commission in 1982. In his message, the Governor called the program "outdated" and called for development of a new "sensible and fiscally responsible" plan.

I am writing to ask that you honor the veto for many reasons.

It is important to note that I do not own or have access to Hollister Ranch although I have had the privilege to visit on a few occasions.

We need to protect what is left of our coastal resources and consider preserving this stretch of coast that embodies southern California before it was urbanized.

A few flaws with the 1982 program are:

1. Assumes the existence of a YMCA camp which was never built. Essentially proposes extension of the Gaviota State Park for the entire 8 1/2 miles of the Hollister Ranch coastline.
2. Requires expensive, contentious and complicated trail and road easements across private parcels, commonly owned parcels and railroad property, and makes no credible estimates of these costs.
3. Assumes the State has the capacity to operate and maintain access in perpetuity without providing credible estimates of costs or the budget, resources and logistics necessary to do so.
4. Assumes extensive mixed pedestrian/bicycle/shuttle bus/auto use of a private, narrow, hilly ranch road without taking into account any usability, safety or traffic engineering standards.
5. Significantly overstates existing use of the Hollister Ranch beaches and declares, without evidence, that adding up to 180,000 or more annual beach users will not negatively impact sensitive resources or the experience.
6. Ignores key public safety challenges (lack of accessible landline or mobile phone communication services, no nearby or timely first responders, and no feasible emergency access to many areas).
7. Proposes extensive development (full time camp hosts and facilities, sanitary facilities, and utilities) to enable overnight camping, an activity which is not currently permitted.

Other items to consider:

1. The updated program should not rely upon property acquisitions through condemnation or illegal exactions.
2. The real geographic/physical challenges and practical limits of access to the Hollister Ranch should be responsibly addressed, especially with regard to absence of infrastructure and services, challenging topography, sensitive habitat, the railroad, and private property rights and interests.
3. The responsible public entities (State Parks, County Sheriff, County Fire) already face significant operations, maintenance, and public safety challenges for this part of the coast. The updated program should honestly and responsibly address the substantial cost and logistical burdens Hollister Ranch access would place on these agencies.
4. Limited human use of the coast between Gaviota and Jalama is one of its most unique assets. The area has only become more special since 1982 because of the level of preservation that has occurred as compared to beaches throughout the rest of Southern California and the Central Coast. The program should recognize the responsibility to protect this experience and the sensitive and significant coastal resources that result from it.
5. The program should acknowledge and incorporate the significant existing and planned managed access programs that focus on underserved and special needs populations who would not benefit from a coastal trail or shuttle service.

The Coastal Commission is in place to protect what is left of our special and very beautiful California Coastline. We hope we can count on you to do the right thing. The Commission should follow the direction given by the Governor in his veto message on AB 2534.

Thank You and Warmest Regards,
Scott Kidd

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Duffy Witmer <duffwitmer@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 9:36 AM
To: Coastal Hollitser
Cc: Greg Linder
Subject: Hollister Ranch

Sirs :

The Hollister Ranch property is a very special part of our California coast line. The Hollister family, and the current property owners have been wonderful stewards of this precious and historic land. My family has known the Hollister's, and I was at one time fortunate to be a landowner. I believe the association of landowners truly believe they want to protect the environmental importance of there property. I also believe that today's owners of the Hollister Ranch want to properly share, and welcome others to enjoy their special land. Proper management of this land is important. I know first hand that the current land owners want to environmentally protect the Hollister Ranch, and at the same time; the land owners respect the concept of providing reasonable access to this unique and special place.

Nothing good happens quickly. The land owners of the Hollister Ranch care deeply about their pristine property. The landowners want to reasonably share their property with people that appreciate the Ranch's long history, and environmental sensitivities.

For the generations that will follow us, I hope that you have the foresight today to appreciate how wonderfully the property is being currently managed. Tens of thousands of people love the way this property is today. Please trust that today's owners of the Hollister Ranch will oversee this special place with true respect and overwhelming love.

Thank you,
Duffy Witmer.

Sent from my iPad

From: James Garavente <jameseg@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 10:15 AM
To: Coastal Hollister
Subject: The Hollister Ranch

To Whom it May Concern,

As a resident and citizen of California, I wanted to comment on ongoing discussions regarding The Hollister Ranch. I live in Los Angeles, am an avid surfer and very active in environmental causes, specifically as they relate to our coasts and ocean. The Hollister Ranch is such a unique and well preserved stretch of coastline that the utmost careful planning is in order before any managed access program is implemented.

That is why a careful examination of the program developed in 1982 needs to be done. It is outdated, we have a deeper understanding of environmental impact issues now and even the YMCA camp referenced does not exist. Furthermore, Governor Brown recently vetoed a rushed plan with the message that all interested parties should examine and negotiate a thoughtful approach to managed access. The inter-agency working group proposed to work on changes to the 1982 plan should also include The Hollister Ranch Owners Association. They have an intimate knowledge of the property, many are staunch environmentalists, deeply committed to the stewardship of the land. And I think all owners are very interested in coming to the table to find an equitable solution.

The 1982 program is so outdated, that looking through the lens of 2018 and beyond it brings up some serious questions regarding costs to the taxpayer, environmental degradation and does not take into account the complexities of individual landowners and access. There is a solution, but it will require significant study, discussion and budgeting. The fear is if we rush this process now, we ruin a beautiful piece of the California legacy. We are responsible for careful stewardship and we should come together to realize a program that works for all of us.

On that note, I want to thank you for reading my concerns and for The California Coastal Commissions ongoing mission to protect and preserve our coasts. The Hollister Ranch is a special place and deserves real care and attention.

Sincerely,

James Garavente
--
Jim Garavente
310.487.4142-cell

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Ellen mccafferty <ellenomontgomery@icloud.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 10:40 AM
To: Coastal Hollister
Subject: Hollister Ranch

I am interested in seeing Hollister Ranch preserved as is because it is one of the few remains stretches of coastline in Southern California that has not been scarred by development. The state cannot maintain existing facilities properly i.e., the Gaviota pier so why acquire 8 1/2 more miles of beach to extend Gaviota Park? What is the compelling reason to destroy and develop this piece of preserved and pristine coastline? There are a lot of proposed structures in the outdated 1982 plan. Who will be responsible for maintaining them, providing security and how will they be paid for? The 1982 plan is extremely outdated and needs a thoughtful overhaul and the HROA should be included in the inter-agency working group. The HROA has done an excellent job providing managed access for special needs populations and I would prefer to see that program expanded rather than seeing a bunch of poorly maintained public facilities on the beaches of Hollister Ranch. The updated program should not rely on acquiring property through illegal actions or condemnations.

Sincerely,
Ellen Mccafferty

From: Hogan, Phil <PHogan@fugro.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 11:30 AM
To: Coastal Hollister
Subject: Hollister Ranch Public Comment Letter - Phil Hogan

Dear California Coastal Commissioners,

My name is Phillip Hogan, I live in Santa Barbara, and am writing you to share my concerns about coastal protection, specifically with respect to Hollister Ranch. My background is in marine geology; I am a practicing registered engineering geologist. Me and my family are familiar with the issues, historical background, & controversy regarding the public's desired access to Hollister Ranch.

I am concerned about protecting our coastal resources and preserving an environmentally sensitive, very special stretch of coast that embodies southern California before it was urbanized. We have walked and kayaked into Hollister Ranch on many occasions, and treasure the beauty and unspoiled nature of the environment. It should be protected.

We understand that a program was developed in 1982 and never implemented because the YMCA sold their property, which was accessed via Hollister Ranch. The 1982 program is now outdated and not relevant to today. The 1982 document assumes the existence of a YMCA camp which was never built, and a road easement that was abandoned decades ago when the YMCA property was sold to Hollister Ranch. The Commission should follow the direction recently given by the Governor in his veto message on AB 2534. The 1982 agreement requires a complete and carefully developed overhaul working with property owners, not a quick cosmetic tune up.

The Commission has proposed an inter-agency working group consisting of State Parks, Coastal Conservancy, Coastal Commission and State Lands Commission to solicit and work on changes to the 1982 program. Given that the property is privately owned, I believe that it would make sense for the principle landowner & shareholder, Hollister Ranch, to be included in this process if it moves forward.

I think that the status quo is an excellent place to start, as the public has access to the Ranch by walking along the beach (up to the mean high tide mark) or by boating in from the east. The walk is beautiful, and is entirely along the beach. Given that it is a long walk there is not a lot of foot traffic (or trash!), which helps keep the environment, including the coastal seabuffs, pristine. I don't think that a trail should be developed away from the beach, as it will lead to degradation of the environment, including environmentally sensitive species.

I also don't think that the public have any right to use the private roads on Hollister Ranch. The roads are private property, and are not owned by the public. I am a firm believer in property rights. The public has no right to force itself onto private property. If the owners of Hollister Ranch don't want cars, bikes, & trucks on their roads such vehicles (& inevitable conflicts that go along with traffic created by such vehicles) should not be forced upon them. The public at large should, however, be allowed to access the Ranch via the beach and water, as has been the case for decades. After all, why fix something if it's not broken?

Hollister Ranch is (and has been for >150 years) a working cattle ranch. The owners deserve their privacy. Why is the Commission proposing a public access program on a private, 14,500 acre working cattle

ranch? The Ranch already has a managed access program for schoolchildren, veterans, and people with disabilities. I've heard that this program works well, and is due to be expanded.

Limited human use of the coast between Gaviota and Jalama is one of its most unique assets. The area has only become more special since 1982 because of the level of preservation that has occurred as compared to beaches throughout the rest of Southern California and the Central Coast.

I would like to thank the Commission for the opportunity to comment. Please acknowledge receipt and respond to my questions at your convenience.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dr. Phillip J. Hogan
Marine and Coastal Engineering Geologist
30 Miramar Avenue
Santa Barbara, CA 93108
(805) 732-1510

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Locklin, Linda@Coastal
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 11:40 AM
To: Coastal Hollister
Subject: FW: Hollister Ranch public use proposal

From: Jim Kverno [<mailto:jimkverno@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 11:38 AM
To: Locklin, Linda@Coastal
Subject: Hollister Ranch public use proposal.

Coastal Commissioner:

I am writing this letter of support for the continued protection of the fragile environment of Hollister Ranch. As a longtime user/caretaker (40 years) and friend/advisor of several property owners, I believe I understand many of the the issues confronting purposed public access and implications. Historically, this coastline represents the last stronghold of pristine Southern California coast. It is an endangered species indeed. In their unrealistic proposals, the agencies involved show little or no respect for the existing cattle ranch and property rights of caretaker/owners in proposing increased public access. This is not an appropriate area to develop due to extreme geological formations, dangerously unstable shale cliffs looming over most of the beach. Also the existing narrow, twisting roadway that serpentine through extremely mountainous terrain cannot safely handle increased traffic. Use by an inexperienced public would certainly be unwise and dangerous. The question of who would fund these improvements (?) and ongoing costs have not been considered. The safety infrastructure required (lifeguards, emergency personnel, fire depts., parking, day use facilities, easement purchase, etc.) would be cost prohibitive as well as nearly impossible. There are also many fragile animal species that stand to be jeopardized by increased public encroachment. To my knowledge, no mention has been made of any environmental impact studies in their proposals. Far too many physical and fiscal hurdles exist to consider rewriting the existing 1982 settlement to safely accommodate further public use. First and foremost, this is private property. The legal battles surrounding such short sided proposals will never be resolved. Amtrak considerations also deem increased public access as unsafe and unrealistic. The involved federal, state and local agencies need to back off their demands and work closely with the land owners (HROA) before restructuring the use of Hollister Ranch. Keep things the way they are and structure public visitations according to the existing settlement.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Jim Kverno, retired educator 138 Andrew Avenue Encinitas CA 92024 760-436-5789

From: Jim Kverno <jimkverno@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 11:42 AM
To: Coastal Hollister
Subject: Hollister Ranch public use proposal

Hollister Ranch Owners Association

I am writing this letter of support for the continued protection of the fragile environment of Hollister Ranch. As a longtime user/caretaker (40 years) and friend/advisor of several property owners, I believe I understand many of the the issues confronting proposed public access and implications. Historically, this coastline represents the last stronghold of pristine Southern California coast. It is an endangered species indeed.

In their unrealistic proposals, the agencies involved show little or no respect for the existing cattle ranch and property rights of caretaker/owners in proposing increased public access. This is not an appropriate area to develop due to extreme geological formations, dangerously unstable shale cliffs looming over most of the beach. Also the existing narrow, twisting roadway that serpentine through extremely mountainous terrain cannot safely handle increased traffic. Use by an inexperienced public would certainly be unwise and dangerous.

The question of who would fund these improvements (?) and ongoing costs have not been considered. The safety infrastructure required (lifeguards, emergency personnel, fire depts., parking, day use facilities, easement purchase, etc.) would be cost prohibitive as well as nearly impossible. There are also many fragile animal species that stand to be jeopardized by increased public encroachment. To my knowledge, no mention has been made of any environmental impact studies in their proposals. Far too many physical and fiscal hurdles exist to consider rewriting the existing 1982 settlement to safely accommodate further public use.

First and foremost, this is private property. The legal battles surrounding such short sided proposals will never be resolved. Amtrak considerations also deem increased public access as unsafe and unrealistic. The involved federal, state and local agencies need to back off their demands and work closely with the land owners (HROA) before restructuring the use of Hollister Ranch. Keep things the way they are and structure public visitations according to the existing settlement.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Jim Kverno, retired educator
138 Andrew Avenue
Encinitas CA 92024
760-436-5789

CC: Calif Coastal Commissioners

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Coastal Hollitser
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 11:43 AM
To: 'Tina Borden'; Coastal Hollitser
Subject: RE: 12/14 Meeting Questions

Tina-
At this time we don't have the answers to your questions - this is an evolving Program. You might want to watch the Coastal Commission briefing on Friday as these questions may be raised.
Linda

Linda Locklin
Coastal Access Program Manager
831-427-4875

Visit the CCC website: <http://www.coastal.ca.gov/> Every Californian should conserve water. Find out how at: SaveOurWater.com · Drought.CA.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Tina Borden [mailto:tina_borden@mac.com]
Sent: Monday, December 10, 2018 8:28 PM
To: Coastal Hollitser
Subject: 12/14 Meeting Questions

After reading through the Hollister Ranch Access Program Overview prior to the meeting on December 14th, 2018, I have a few questions:

1. Who is going to pay for this? Not only will it be costly to build out this plan (facilities, roads, trails, etc.) but the on-going maintenance tab will be exorbitant.
2. What authorization is required to build/use roads/trails across private property?
3. Will the state be required to seize private property in order to implement this plan? If yes, what is the estimated cost to do so?

Thank you for your time and consideration to these questions.

Tina Borden

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: david nagel <dknagel4u@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 11:48 AM
To: Coastal Hollitser
Subject: Public Access to Hollister Ranch

RE: Hollister Ranch

Dear Members of the Coastal Commission,

My name is David Nagel and I worked for 12 years as an environmental analyst in San Diego County. I now reside in Cambria, California. I have carefully followed the discussion related to greater public access to the Hollister Ranch. In addition, I'm very much concerned that California make the best use of its efforts and resources. I understand that imminent domain has been proposed as a possible option and further understand that, among other things, this requires evidence that such a move is both a public necessity (e.g. schools, essential roads) and compensation must be paid. Given this, could you please address the following:

1. PLEASE CLARIFY WHY GAINING ACCESS TO THE HOLLISTER RANCH IS A PUBLIC NECESSITY?
2. PROVIDE AN ESTIMATE, INCLUDING A HIGH AND LOW RANGE, FOR THE TOTAL COSTS OF THE PROJECT INCLUDING, BUT NOT LIMITED TO, PROVIDING COMPENSATION TO THE HOLLISTER RANCH OWNERS.

I greatly appreciate your work and look forward to the two questions being discussed answered. I feel myself and other citizens of California need to know up front the cost and rationale for how their resources will be utilized.

Sincerely,

David Nagel
1715 Berwick Drive
Cambria, California

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Tavis Boise <tavis.w.boise1994@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 12:15 PM
To: Coastal Hollister
Subject: Hollister Ranch

Dear California Coastal Commission

My name is Tavis Boise and I am an owner at Hollister Ranch. The reason I am writing this letter is because I feel that in these legal battles and media outrage, the story of the impact on myself and my community have been lost in the fray.

On March 5, 1994 my mother gave birth to me at our house up San Augustine Canyon in Hollister Ranch. Growing up on the ranch was a different experience than one might expect. My earliest memory includes my parents explaining to me on a hike, how to raise one's jacket overhead in order to make my three year-old body look less tasty to a mountain lion. This was the case for the few dozen kids that grew up on the ranch. Stewardship and respect for nature were the core ideals that were passed down to our generation and we embraced them wholeheartedly. My mother (a botanist) and my father (green childcare consultant) worked hard to provide for our family, all while upholding their personal mission, to make the world a better place for my sister and I. This is the mission that I intend on fulfilling.

My sister and I have both been attracted to environmental studies in college (Humboldt for her, San Francisco State for me), and we are keenly aware of the negative impacts humans have on nature. The Hollister Ranch and the surrounding Gaviota Coast have the most pristine wilderness areas of anywhere in Southern California. The introduction of more human development, like those in the details spelled out in the 1982 program, would threaten coastal habitat, likely to the point beyond recovery for species endangered by climate change, human encroachment, and decades of irresponsible fishing and hunting practices. The revision of this plan needs careful consideration and input from the community of Hollister Ranch, who know the land in question better than any. The introduction of 180,000 more people annually (estimates courtesy of the 1982 plan) to this delicate region would be catastrophic to the viability of ecosystem services and would undoubtedly result in the death of many fauna that cross the narrow and windy roads and canyon passes. The 1982 plan does not include any substantive consideration of the environmental threats of today and the future, nor does it reconcile the safety considerations of the public (being in a remote area).

There are many challenges that we as a society face. It is my opinion that the time, effort and resources spent by both sides of this battle are detrimental to all stakeholders, and that the common goal of protecting our natural environment is being forgotten.

The challenges my generation faces are extreme. We did not fail to address climate change. We did not ask for costly wars, and an unjust political and economic system. We neither want our environment to fail us, nor resource demands to divide us. We did not ask for this world, however it is our's to inherit. We will set aside our differences, our philosophies, our theologies. We will come together to resolve the problems we face. For if we don't all is lost.

The home my grandparents built in the 1970's up San Augustine Canyon has been an incredible blessing. It was a dream growing up in the same house as my father. The house my grandmother and mother died in. It is part of the wilderness that surrounds it, and it has given my sister and I an experience that likely no child will have again.

Please keep in mind the responsibility we all have to protect our environment.
Please understand who and what will be most affected by your decisions.
Please recognize that this last relatively untouched region of the Gaviota Coast will be changed forever by the choices you and I make.
Please help preserve the natural beauty of the Hollister Ranch.

Thank you for your time.
Sincerely,

Tavis Boise
(student, public servant, youth organizer/activist, concerned citizen)

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Luke McDonough <luke@air.tv>
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 12:17 PM
To: Coastal Hollister
Subject: RE: Hollister Beach access

Dear Coastal Commission,

I live in Los Angeles. I am an avid surfer, an active environmentalist, and a 20-year CA taxpayer.

What is the goal for Hollister?

I surf the ranch, by boat...on big swells, there are dozens of other guys there in boats... but it is still the least crowded, high-quality spot because it is remote & inconvenient: We all have access, but if we make the access easy, we will lose the last best place to surf in CA.

I have also been a guest at the ranch... and Hollister is the most pristine beach I have seen in CA: Access is good, but easy access = all other CA beaches = Less wildlife, more trash.

The legal details are complicated... but it seems clear that the path to "more access" will be long & expensive... what do we taxpayers get for that money? "More" access, for the non-surfing public, to a beach that is bordered by tens of miles of nearly identical, public beaches? Road access for surfers who do not care enough to boat in?

What principal is at stake? Is it the one that says Vinod Khosla should not be allowed to cut off existing access, over a legal technicality? I support that one... But this is not that.

The answer, it seems, is political, not rational: You fought long and hard to get the best deal you could...then people got upset, because they think Hollister = Geffen blocking access in Malibu, or Vinod in SC: They imagine black-hat billionaires stealing a beach... but you all know that is not the case at Hollister... and you know that the legal options at Hollister are murkier and less predictable than they are/were in Malibu or SC.

It is understandable that the public reacted the way it did... But it is not defensible to agree with the public view, in your own public statements & policy proposals, if you don't actually agree with them.

Please save our surf break, our beach, and our tax dollars.

Best,

David McDonough
5078 W 4th ST
Los Angeles, CA, 90020

From: Dale and Marilyn Ghere <dmghere@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 12:19 PM
To: Coastal Hollister
Subject: Hollister Ranch Public Access Program

December 11, 2018

To: California State Coastal Commission
Re: December 14 the Coastal Commission informational briefing on the 1982 Hollister Ranch Public Access Program.
From: Dale Ghere, resident of Laguna Beach, past V.P. of the Friends of the Newport Coast which oversaw the development of Crystal Cove State Park and the adjoining Irvine properties.

Dear Commissioners,

I am concerned about the present concept to change the plans that are presently in place for the coastal portion of the Hollister Ranch. I would think that before the Commission starts considering changes a committee of the various parties that would oversee this project should come up with goals for the access and use of this property for the foreseeable future. This should include the property owners of the Ranch. I would think a plan that would oversee the next forty years would be a reasonable starting point.

My major concern is that the present plans will give access to the public with few long term guidelines for what will happen in the future. It is not a far fetched assumption that poor or rushed planning now will lead to poor budget backing for the project. If the State does not have a pre-planned budget source then sometime in the future the property access route could be turned over to private concessionaires in order to get out of a financial mess. If that were to happen there would be major changes in the quality of the present natural environment. In time more construction would be requested by the concessionaires to provide an even greater use of the property. All of these issues had to be faced and dealt with during the development of Crystal Cove State Park.

The State of California has designated many areas of the coastline as Marine Protection sites. With the Hollister Ranch properties much of what the State wants done to protect the coastline is already being accomplished by limiting access to the area. The Coastal Commission should do what is needed to help protect this unique piece of the coastline. In some cases protection is more important than open access to every part of the coast. In the case of the Hollister Ranch it seems reasonable to continue allowing limited access to the coast by the present owners of the Ranch which includes support for educational and biological study programs. I do not believe that giving unlimited public access to all portions of the Hollister Ranch coastline is a wise position to support.

Thank you for considering my position on this issue.

Dale Ghere
915 Meadowlark Lane
Laguna Beach, CA 92651

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Pat Devaney <pdevaney@ymail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 12:26 PM
To: Coastal Hollister; Ainsworth, John@Coastal; Locklin, Linda@Coastal; Christie, Sarah@Coastal
Subject: Hollister Ranch Access

Hello,

My note here is in concern of the proposed access discussion to Hollister Ranch.

I've lived in Santa Barbara for 21 years and have a pretty good understanding of our surrounding area of trails and beaches.

Hollister Ranch is one last vestiges of undeveloped acreage and beach areas that has been protected from urbanization and open access to the public.

We don't have many ares left on the California coast that still possess this unique protected environment of an un-trampled resource.

I've read through the 1982 proposed access program that was overstated and not thought through in 1982 and certainly out of date and needing a complete rewrite in 2018. This special part of the coast is in a very different world today than in 1982 and needs a thoughtfully constructed long range access plan.

Critical would be to have the Hollister Ranch owners involved in the development of this plan. I'm not sure how you could not have them as active participants given their intimate knowledge of the area.

This should not be a rushed quick fix for instant access. A careful long term vision needs to be worked on given the difficult topography, expensive related costs, sensitive habitats and limited infrastructure to support access. We have the opportunity to do something significant in protecting this special part of the coast.

Thank you for taking the time to read my note.

Best,

Pat Devaney

pdevaney@ymail.com

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Locklin, Linda@Coastal
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 12:28 PM
To: Coastal Hollitser
Subject: FW: Hollister Ranch Access

-----Original Message-----

From: Pat Devaney [mailto:pdevaney@ymail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 12:26 PM
To: Coastal Hollitser; Ainsworth, John@Coastal; Locklin, Linda@Coastal; Christie, Sarah@Coastal
Subject: Hollister Ranch Access

Hello,

My note here is in concern of the proposed access discussion to Hollister Ranch.

I've lived in Santa Barbara for 21 years and have a pretty good understanding of our surrounding area of trails and beaches.

Hollister Ranch is one last vestiges of undeveloped acreage and beach areas that has been protected from urbanization and open access to the public.

We don't have many areas left on the California coast that still possess this unique protected environment of an untrampled resource.

I've read through the 1982 proposed access program that was overstated and not thought through in 1982 and certainly out of date and needing a complete rewrite in 2018. This special part of the coast is in a very different world today than in 1982 and needs a thoughtfully constructed long range access plan.

Critical would be to have the Hollister Ranch owners involved in the development of this plan. I'm not sure how you could not have them as active participants given their intimate knowledge of the area.

This should not be a rushed quick fix for instant access. A careful long term vision needs to be worked on given the difficult topography, expensive related costs, sensitive habitats and limited infrastructure to support access. We have the opportunity to do something significant in protecting this special part of the coast.

Thank you for taking the time to read my note.

Best,

Pat Devaney

pdevaney@ymail.com

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Locklin, Linda@Coastal
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 12:29 PM
To: Coastal Hollister
Subject: FW: Hollister Ranch public access proposal.

-----Original Message-----

From: Ainsworth, John@Coastal
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 12:27 PM
To: Locklin, Linda@Coastal; Christie, Sarah@Coastal
Subject: FW: Hollister Ranch public access proposal.

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Kverno <jimkverno@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 11:35 AM
To: Ainsworth, John@Coastal <John.Ainsworth@coastal.ca.gov>
Subject: Hollister Ranch public access proposal.

Coastal Commissioner:

I am writing this letter of support for the continued protection of the fragile environment of Hollister Ranch. As a longtime user/caretaker (40 years) and friend/advisor of several property owners, I believe I understand many of the the issues confronting proposed public access and implications. Historically, this coastline represents the last stronghold of pristine Southern California coast. It is an endangered species indeed.

In their unrealistic proposals, the agencies involved show little or no respect for the existing cattle ranch and property rights of caretaker/owners in proposing increased public access. This is not an appropriate area to develop due to extreme geological formations, dangerously unstable shale cliffs looming over most of the beach. Also the existing narrow, twisting roadway that serpentine through extremely mountainous terrain cannot safely handle increased traffic. Use by an inexperienced public would certainly be unwise and dangerous.

The question of who would fund these improvements (?) and ongoing costs have not been considered. The safety infrastructure required (lifeguards, emergency personnel, fire depts., parking, day use facilities, easement purchase, etc.) would be cost prohibitive as well as nearly impossible. There are also many fragile animal species that stand to be jeopardized by increased public encroachment. To my knowledge, no mention has been made of any environmental impact studies in their proposals. Far too many physical and fiscal hurdles exist to consider rewriting the existing 1982 settlement to safely accommodate further public use.

First and foremost, this is private property. The legal battles surrounding such short sided proposals will never be resolved. Amtrak considerations also deem increased public access as unsafe and unrealistic. The involved federal, state and local agencies need to back off their demands and work closely with the land owners (HROA) before restructuring the use of Hollister Ranch. Keep things the way they are and structure public visitations according to the existing settlement.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Jim Kverno, retired educator
138 Andrew Avenue
Encinitas CA 92024
760-436-5789

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Locklin, Linda@Coastal
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 12:29 PM
To: Coastal Hollitser
Subject: FW: Hollister Ranch Access

-----Original Message-----

From: Pat Devaney [mailto:pdevaney@ymail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 12:26 PM
To: Coastal Hollitser; Ainsworth, John@Coastal; Locklin, Linda@Coastal; Christie, Sarah@Coastal
Subject: Hollister Ranch Access

Hello,

My note here is in concern of the proposed access discussion to Hollister Ranch.

I've lived in Santa Barbara for 21 years and have a pretty good understanding of our surrounding area of trails and beaches.

Hollister Ranch is one last vestiges of undeveloped acreage and beach areas that has been protected from urbanization and open access to the public.

We don't have many areas left on the California coast that still possess this unique protected environment of an untrampled resource.

I've read through the 1982 proposed access program that was overstated and not thought through in 1982 and certainly out of date and needing a complete rewrite in 2018. This special part of the coast is in a very different world today than in 1982 and needs a thoughtfully constructed long range access plan.

Critical would be to have the Hollister Ranch owners involved in the development of this plan. I'm not sure how you could not have them as active participants given their intimate knowledge of the area.

This should not be a rushed quick fix for instant access. A careful long term vision needs to be worked on given the difficult topography, expensive related costs, sensitive habitats and limited infrastructure to support access. We have the opportunity to do something significant in protecting this special part of the coast.

Thank you for taking the time to read my note.

Best,

Pat Devaney

pdevaney@ymail.com

Locklin, Linda@Coastal

From: Locklin, Linda@Coastal
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 12:29 PM
To: Coastal Hollister
Subject: FW: Hollister Ranch public access proposal.

-----Original Message-----

From: Ainsworth, John@Coastal
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 12:29 PM
To: Locklin, Linda@Coastal; Christie, Sarah@Coastal
Subject: FW: Hollister Ranch public access proposal.

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Kverno <jimkverno@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 11:35 AM
To: Ainsworth, John@Coastal <John.Ainsworth@coastal.ca.gov>
Subject: Hollister Ranch public access proposal.

Coastal Commissioner:

I am writing this letter of support for the continued protection of the fragile environment of Hollister Ranch. As a longtime user/caretaker (40 years) and friend/advisor of several property owners, I believe I understand many of the the issues confronting purposed public access and implications. Historically, this coastline represents the last stronghold of pristine Southern California coast. It is an endangered species indeed.

In their unrealistic proposals, the agencies involved show little or no respect for the existing cattle ranch and property rights of caretaker/owners in proposing increased public access. This is not an appropriate area to develop due to extreme geological formations, dangerously unstable shale cliffs looming over most of the beach. Also the existing narrow, twisting roadway that serpentine through extremely mountainous terrain cannot safely handle increased traffic. Use by an inexperienced public would certainly be unwise and dangerous.

The question of who would fund these improvements (?) and ongoing costs have not been considered. The safety infrastructure required (lifeguards, emergency personnel, fire depts., parking, day use facilities, easement purchase, etc.) would be cost prohibitive as well as nearly impossible. There are also many fragile animal species that stand to be jeopardized by increased public encroachment. To my knowledge, no mention has been made of any environmental impact studies in their proposals. Far too many physical and fiscal hurdles exist to consider rewriting the existing 1982 settlement to safely accommodate further public use.

First and foremost, this is private property. The legal battles surrounding such short sided proposals will never be resolved. Amtrak considerations also deem increased public access as unsafe and unrealistic. The involved federal, state and local agencies need to back off their demands and work closely with the land owners (HROA) before restructuring the use of Hollister Ranch. Keep things the way they are and structure public visitations according to the existing settlement.

Thank you for considering my concerns.

Jim Kverno, retired educator
138 Andrew Avenue
Encinitas CA 92024
760-436-5789

From: Carla Scherdlinger <cscherdlinger@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 11, 2018 12:30 PM
To: Coastal Hollitser
Cc: Hollister Ranch
Subject: Hollister Ranch public access

To the Coastal Commission:

I have been an owner at the Hollister Ranch since 1977, and currently reside in San Diego. We have never had a residence at the Ranch, but rather have used it as a treasured location for family visits since our children, now grown, were very small. We lived for 22 years in the Owens Valley, and grew to appreciate the outdoors that up there is mercifully uncrowded and unspoiled. Having that condition on the Ranch has always been precious to us.

We have been aware of public access issues since the early 1980's, and have been interested that the State has not elected to pursue such access. The Ranch is a special situation as regards the public, as no single owner legally CAN grant access to the beach, as none of us own it individually. As Governor Brown recently determined, the plans from 1982 were never implemented, and probably for good reason. The Ranch enjoys a really phenomenal state of preservation to this day, in large part because it is not overwhelmed with people. As owners, we observe strict self-imposed regulations on land use, and that has resulted in an exceptional and unspoiled condition for the land and the coastline beaches. If the 1982 access program is to be revived, it requires a complete and carefully developed overhaul, not a quick cosmetic tune up. Major problems that I see with this include:

- The proposed vehicle access would open up not only the beaches but potentially other Ranch properties to increased risk of fire and environmental damage, and loss of privacy.
- The CCC's current position appears to essentially propose an extension of the Gaviota State Park for the entire 8 ½ miles of the Ranch coastline, which would require an extensive suite of improvements the absence of which contributes considerably to the current unspoiled condition of the coast
- The anticipated plan would be really expensive; if costs extending into perpetuity have been estimated, they should be made public so that it can be determined if it is a wise use of State resources..
- The notion that the existing road can accommodate the mixed use of vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycles is highly unreasonable.
- The proposed daily head count at the beaches is of special concern, as nothing even approaching that level of use has ever occurred on these beaches. Their character would change dramatically under the proposed levels of use.
- The addition of campgrounds and concessions is a far departure from the use to which the Ranch beaches are currently made, which is for very low impact use by just a few people at a time. The Ranch's current programs for admitting the public have been designed with coastal protection of foremost concern; any CCC action should endeavor to respect this level of usage.
- We understand that the CCC has proposed an inter-agency working group consisting of State Parks, Coastal Conservancy, Coastal Commission and State Lands Commission to solicit and work on changes to the 1982 program. It would make a great deal of sense for the principle landowner, Hollister Ranch, to be included in this process. Furthermore, it is important that any program moving forward acknowledge that any updated program should not rely upon property acquisitions through condemnation or illegal taking of personal or community property. The fact that there is a railroad easement for the entire length of the Ranch coastline is also a complicating factor. As Ranch owners

provide for our own security and safety, it should be faced clearly that increased use will require a significant challenge to provide for operations, maintenance, and public safety for this part of the coast. Partner agencies must be prepared to assume these costs.

- Finally, it is important to realize that the limited human use of the coast between Gaviota and Jalama is one of its most unique characteristics. The area has only become more environmentally precious since 1982 because of the level of preservation and stewardship that has occurred as compared to beaches throughout the rest of Southern California and the Central Coast. Any public access program should recognize the responsibility to protect this experience and the sensitive and significant coastal resources that result from the land's current condition.

It is worth asking, at this point, how the CCC would propose to provide more access but protect sensitive coastal resources, given that this area has no public roads, has limited communication and emergency services, and no public utilities?

I am certain that the CCC has every intention of addressing these critical issues. I appreciate the opportunity to comment, and hope that regionally sensitive environmental resources that require protection well into the future do not take a back seat to a local and recent push for potentially unrealistic short-term goals.

Sincerely,

--

Carla Scheidlinger
6125 Caminito del Oeste
San Diego, CA 92111