


Q1 To help us understand who we are hearing from please check all of the boxes that apply to you.

Answered: 304 Skipped: 1



Conceptual Program: Public Survey

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Resident of north Santa Barbara County	10.86%	33
Resident of south Santa Barbara County	43.75%	133
Visitor only, I do not live or work in Santa Barbara County	26.64%	81
Business owner in the County of Santa Barbara	8.88%	27
Residential property owner in the County of Santa Barbara	34.87%	106
Hollister Ranch property owner	12.83%	39
Chumash tribal member	0.33%	1
Employed in the County of Santa Barbara	11.51%	35
Student in the County of Santa Barbara	1.64%	5
Surfer	41.45%	126
Other (please specify)	22.37%	68
Total Respondents: 304		

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Sonoma County resident	7/6/2021 1:33 PM
2	NGO working on a range of coastal issues affecting Santa Barbara County for the past 40 years.	7/6/2021 12:46 PM
3	Sonoma county resident	7/6/2021 12:16 PM
4	Ventura resident	7/6/2021 12:13 PM
5	hiker	7/6/2021 11:54 AM
6	Bird enviornmentalistr	7/6/2021 10:25 AM
7	I was lucky enough to have enjoyed legal access to Hollister Ranch beaches from 1965-1971.	7/5/2021 5:34 PM
8	Geology naturalist leading field trips for schools and community organizations	7/5/2021 4:15 PM
9	Retiree, photographer	7/5/2021 3:35 PM
10	I love walking on public coastal preserves	7/4/2021 3:26 PM
11	I am a notary public loan signing agent. My work takes me to Los Olivos/Santa Ynez areas so I drive the coast often. I see people, some with kids, parking along the RR tracks to get to the beach. Seems we need more access that is planned to be safer while providing us all a way to enjoy our beaches!	7/4/2021 2:17 PM
12	resident of Goleta City	7/4/2021 1:28 PM
13	UCSB grad, SoCal resident, Environmental Educator	7/4/2021 8:55 AM
14	Enjoy all outdoor activities our are offered. Hiking, biking, camping, etc	7/3/2021 6:05 PM
15	I live on and revere the California Coast.	7/3/2021 6:02 PM
16	retired UCSB professor	7/3/2021 5:35 PM
17	kayaker	7/3/2021 12:51 PM
18	indigenous	7/3/2021 10:27 AM
19	Environmentalist concerned that a scarce natural resource may be damaged or lost	7/3/2021 8:45 AM
20	artist	7/2/2021 9:43 PM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey

21	Frequent visitor to the Gaviota area from Arroyo Grande, CA	7/2/2021 7:02 PM
22	I think public access is important	7/2/2021 7:02 PM
23	Paddler	7/2/2021 6:05 PM
24	Native of northern SBCO	7/2/2021 5:47 PM
25	Former 40 year resident of SB County, former Ranch owner, HROA Design Committee member (6 years), former Santa Bárbara Unified School District teacher (20 years), California Real Estate Broker, Pepperdine Law graduate, frequent visitor to family in SB, and current resident of Hawaii.	7/2/2021 5:18 PM
26	Bird watcher	7/2/2021 5:16 PM
27	Hiker	7/2/2021 5:07 PM
28	Retired	7/2/2021 5:00 PM
29	Retired beachgoer	7/2/2021 4:55 PM
30	conservation minded community member	7/2/2021 4:08 PM
31	freelance writer in Montecito	7/2/2021 4:06 PM
32	The is the closest spot for good surf from where I live in Solvang, CA.	7/2/2021 3:55 PM
33	Interested party- sister of late CC Executive Director Peter Douglas	7/2/2021 3:38 PM
34	Environmentalist	7/2/2021 2:10 PM
35	Beach goer to body surf and swim and to walk our two dogs.	7/1/2021 6:11 PM
36	California Coastal Commission employee	7/1/2021 4:47 PM
37	user of walking, bicycling and public transit for in-county transportation needs	7/1/2021 4:28 PM
38	environmental advocate	7/1/2021 4:17 PM
39	employee of hollister ranch	7/1/2021 10:17 AM
40	consultant	6/30/2021 11:37 PM
41	Representative for the Santa Barbara Audubon Society	6/30/2021 8:58 AM
42	Cycling enthusiast and environmentalist	6/30/2021 8:02 AM
43	Member of public	6/30/2021 4:20 AM
44	Cyclist	6/29/2021 7:32 PM
45	Fisherman	6/29/2021 6:52 PM
46	Gaviota Coast Land Owner /steward	6/29/2021 6:09 PM
47	kayaker, hiker, camper, very interested in protecting wildlife and open spaces along with prompting very passive and thoughtful recreational experiences in those places.	6/29/2021 5:45 PM
48	Californian	6/29/2021 2:17 PM
49	spouse of Hollister Ranch property owner	6/29/2021 2:08 PM
50	a California surfer of 58years; a Hollister & Bixby Ranch "beach entry hiker" and "ranch boat" veteran dating from 1964; a seasonal ranger-employee at Gaviota, Refugio and El Capitan State Parks (1967-1970); an attorney of 46 years; a father of two surfers (and a grandfather of four more);	6/29/2021 1:31 PM
51	Lawyer who respects both private property rights and equality under the law. Mark Twain: "No man's life, liberty, or property are safe while the legislature is in session."	6/29/2021 12:58 PM
52	Kayaker	6/29/2021 12:36 PM
53	Board member, Gaviota Coast Conservancy	6/29/2021 11:42 AM


Conceptual Program: Public Survey

54	Artist	6/29/2021 10:52 AM
55	close friend of a Hollister Ranch owner	6/29/2021 9:31 AM
56	40 years of visiting by boat.	6/29/2021 9:21 AM
57	Have lived in Goleta for over 40 years. Have never been able to surf, or hang out on beaches in the Ranch due to access restrictions	6/29/2021 8:36 AM
58	retired SB County Educator	6/29/2021 7:41 AM
59	relative of owner	6/29/2021 7:02 AM
60	Beach lover	6/28/2021 9:32 PM
61	artist, plein air	6/28/2021 9:24 PM
62	Conservation Biologist	6/28/2021 9:20 PM
63	40 years of ownership (1973-2013) on the Hollister Ranch and full-time resident. Now a visitor.	6/28/2021 8:21 PM
64	Cyclist	6/28/2021 7:57 PM
65	Travel industry professional who sends clients to the area.	6/28/2021 7:49 PM
66	Former resident and student of Santa Barbara county	6/28/2021 7:44 PM
67	one who does not chew on horseshit from warm and fuzzy do-good-ers self anointed to protect Gods Earth	6/28/2021 7:16 PM
68	Avid beach hiker	6/28/2021 7:04 PM

Q2 If I were visiting the beach at Hollister Ranch and saw this many people on the beach, that would be okay with me.

Answered: 297 Skipped: 8

13 ppl/acre dispersed




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Strongly agree	13.80%	41
Agree	19.87%	59
Neither agree nor disagree	7.07%	21
Disagree	17.85%	53
Strongly disagree	41.41%	123
TOTAL		297

Q3 If I were visiting the beach at Hollister Ranch and saw this many people on the beach, that would be okay with me.

Answered: 297

Skipped: 8

13 ppl/acre grouped




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Strongly agree	15.49%	46
Agree	21.55%	64
Neither agree nor disagree	11.78%	35
Disagree	22.56%	67
Strongly disagree	28.62%	85
TOTAL		297

Q4 If I were visiting the beach at Hollister Ranch and saw this many people on the beach, that would be okay with me.

Answered: 292

Skipped: 13

10 ppl/acre dispersed




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Strongly agree	20.89%	61
Agree	19.86%	58
Neither agree nor disagree	9.93%	29
Disagree	15.41%	45
Strongly disagree	33.90%	99
TOTAL		292

Q5 If I were visiting the beach at Hollister Ranch and saw this many people on the beach, that would be okay with me.

Answered: 289

Skipped: 16

10 ppl/acre grouped




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Strongly agree	15.22%	44
Agree	25.95%	75
Neither agree nor disagree	11.76%	34
Disagree	19.72%	57
Strongly disagree	27.34%	79
TOTAL		289

Q6 If I were visiting the beach at Hollister Ranch and saw this many people on the beach, that would be okay with me.

Answered: 291

Skipped: 14

5 ppl/acre dispersed




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Strongly agree	30.24%	88
Agree	29.21%	85
Neither agree nor disagree	8.25%	24
Disagree	12.03%	35
Strongly disagree	20.27%	59
TOTAL		291

Q7 If I were visiting the beach at Hollister Ranch and saw this many people on the beach, that would be okay with me.

Answered: 287

Skipped: 18

5 ppl/acre grouped




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Strongly agree	23.34%	67
Agree	29.97%	86
Neither agree nor disagree	14.29%	41
Disagree	15.68%	45
Strongly disagree	16.72%	48
TOTAL		287

Q8 If I were visiting the beach at Hollister Ranch and saw this many people on the beach, that would be okay with me.

Answered: 289

Skipped: 16

2 ppl/acre per acre




ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Strongly agree	38.06%	110
Agree	32.87%	95
Neither agree nor disagree	12.11%	35
Disagree	8.65%	25
Strongly disagree	8.30%	24
TOTAL		289

Q9 If I were visiting the beach at Hollister Ranch and saw this many people on the beach, that would be okay with me.

Answered: 289

Skipped: 16


1 person per acre



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Strongly agree	41.18%	119
Agree	33.91%	98
Neither agree nor disagree	12.11%	35
Disagree	6.23%	18
Strongly disagree	6.57%	19
TOTAL		289

Q10 If public access to Hollister Ranch beaches is not available every day, more people should be allowed in on the days that they are open.

Answered: 282 Skipped: 23



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Strongly agree	11.35%	32
Agree	14.54%	41
Neither agree nor disagree	17.02%	48
Disagree	21.99%	62
Strongly disagree	35.11%	99
TOTAL		282

#	FEEL FREE TO EXPLAIN WHY OR WHY NOT YOU AGREE/DISAGREE	DATE
1	I don't think that closure on some days followed by more people on others is protective of the environment	7/7/2021 7:21 AM
2	I do not believe access should be closed except in an emergency situation such as a fire	7/6/2021 1:37 PM
3	Any access should be seen as an opportunity, not a daily beach going routine. The reason Hollister is special is because the lack of human traffic and interaction. Increasing the volume of people will take that away until no one wants to go anyhow and it will defeat the purpose.	7/6/2021 8:23 AM
4	Depends on how many are allowed in the first place.	7/5/2021 4:19 PM
5	Beaches should be open to the public every day -- it is California law.	7/5/2021 3:38 PM
6	public access should be limited to very few people on any day - and controlled through docent lead groups to preserve the unique aspect of the Ranch.	7/5/2021 10:34 AM
7	These beaches are pristine. They should be protected. Humans create erosion to the environment as a whole.	7/5/2021 10:23 AM
8	It would be OK provided that the entire ranch is not accessible. For instance, if a shuttle only	7/5/2021 8:12 AM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey

went as far as Razors (or perhaps Bulito on select days), and visitors had to return to the shuttle by 3pm, allowing for more visitors per day would be OK.

9	There should be a set number for ecological and resident impact/ road safety.	7/5/2021 6:31 AM
10	Public access is every day or it is not public access	7/4/2021 3:30 PM
11	If a calendar and/or schedule is provided to the public, people can plan their visit and it will be more enjoyable.	7/4/2021 2:23 PM
12	Should be open more days	7/3/2021 8:59 PM
13	The public has been kept off the beach at Hollister Ranch for far too long! It is not right for it to be just for the wealthy and well-connected. The beach belongs to the people of California, not to a few who do have private property nearby. I own a house near the beach, but I do not have the right to keep other citizens off the beach, as tho it were my private property. People should be allowed on the beach every day, just as they are allowed every day on the beach near my home, and on the other beaches.	7/3/2021 11:55 AM
14	Owners should be allowed at any time. This beach is not "diversified" and has been respected by the owners to remain this way.	7/3/2021 9:26 AM
15	Hollister Ranch should be left as it is. It is private property. People worked hard to purchase property there. There is plenty of beach that is accessible in California. Much of it is State and County property that is terribly maintained now. Why should the public be allowed to access Hollister Ranch when there is plenty of other beach property to visit?	7/3/2021 9:14 AM
16	Too many people at one time will damage the resou.	7/3/2021 8:49 AM
17	Migratory birds use these beaches; lots of people on any particular day will disturb them and possibly lead to their death.	7/3/2021 5:23 AM
18	Needs to be open everyday!	7/2/2021 9:46 PM
19	This place is already accessible and not hard with a little bit of planning and desire,there are already plenty of options to safely and legally enjoy the beaches of holister ranch	7/2/2021 9:29 PM
20	The coast should be ope to all everywhere else in California there is public access available. No one owns the ocean.	7/2/2021 7:09 PM
21	Public access must be every day.	7/2/2021 7:04 PM
22	Too many people make too large an impact on the environment.	7/2/2021 6:54 PM
23	No quota. No lockout days	7/2/2021 6:05 PM
24	As a beach property owner I have seen the litter and destruction the public bring. Neither the county or railroad are willing to take responsibility for trash left behind.	7/2/2021 6:03 PM
25	The quality of experience shouldn't diminish based upon the number of days people can visit	7/2/2021 5:50 PM
26	I think the beach should be open every day. There are no private beaches in California.	7/2/2021 5:32 PM
27	More people than what?	7/2/2021 5:03 PM
28	We've gone over this a million times: the residents of California have legal right of way on beaches. There should NEVER EVER be days when "Hoillister Ranch beaches [are] not available every day." Isn't open access what we've been fighting for the whole time?	7/2/2021 4:35 PM
29	More people allowed to access the beach is at the ranch well negatively impact the current pristine nature of the beaches.	7/2/2021 4:11 PM
30	Access without impediment is what our state constitution states.	7/2/2021 4:05 PM
31	This is a model I am unfamiliar with. Either a beach has public access or not. It doesn't get turned on or off different days.	7/2/2021 4:00 PM
32	The question is confusing. Limits should be based on the environmental impacts.	7/2/2021 2:16 PM
33	safety, environmental impact, infrastructure, experience	7/2/2021 10:28 AM
34	Public access to HR beaches should be available every day because the beaches and near-	7/1/2021 4:23 PM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey

shore recreational resources belong to the public.

35	I feel that the photos are misleading ,in reality 80% of those depicted would be surfing. You should have shown surfers in the small line up at Little Drakes	7/1/2021 3:07 PM
36	This is a very sensitive ecosystem. The pictures shown depict more people that have ever been there. Wildlife will be forced out if this many people come and more trash will be left. Look at Gaviota, Refugio, and el cap state beach for examples. Only a small number of people should be allowed in at a time. Allowing more on other days goes against conservation.	7/1/2021 7:49 AM
37	The proposed numbers are so huge as a starting point for a largely uninhabited wild beach before the "ramping up" numbers and would create such a significant and detrimental impact that even more people would be devastating to the environment as well as any wilderness experience. The more people, the more impact each time--more extreme fire danger, safety , sanitation, concerns etc. The proposed numbers now are so out of balance with what is realistically reasonable. The idea that this question poses makes a bad idea even worse.	6/30/2021 2:08 PM
38	IF THE COAST BELONGS TO THE PEOPLE IT SHOULD BE OPEN EVERY DAY, NO LIMITS AS TO HOW MANY	6/30/2021 12:04 PM
39	More people at the same time means more disturbance for environment and property owner. For the environment it can be really damaging !	6/30/2021 11:50 AM
40	Low impact days to not offset high impact days. High impact days would still harm the natural resources of these sites.	6/30/2021 9:00 AM
41	The Hollister Ranch should remain as is	6/30/2021 8:49 AM
42	the high concentration of people on any given day will still do irreparable damage to the environment whether it is every day or random days.	6/30/2021 8:31 AM
43	This question is unclear. More people than what?	6/30/2021 7:46 AM
44	Public access must be available every day.	6/30/2021 4:22 AM
45	This sets up a fallacious argument. Public access is available every day on virtually every other beach in CA. This reasoning sets the Coastal Access program backward 40 years.	6/29/2021 8:55 PM
46	May need to allow more people on weekends	6/29/2021 7:35 PM
47	No limitations should be placed on accessing our beaches. Isn't that the point of all of this?	6/29/2021 6:56 PM
48	To maintain the "magic" that is HR we must maintain limited access	6/29/2021 6:13 PM
49	Public access should be every day and if for whatever reason it is not then more access is better by any other means.	6/29/2021 4:48 PM
50	I believe there is a limit to how many people can occupy each beach and still preserve it. Don't know that number.	6/29/2021 4:40 PM
51	Low density access to maintain the environment	6/29/2021 3:22 PM
52	Public Access must be available 365 days per year like all other California beaches	6/29/2021 2:26 PM
53	The impact of many people all at once would be far greater than a few over a longer period of time. Safety, traffic, trash, environmental issues	6/29/2021 2:12 PM
54	If the aim is to preserve the character of the place, it does not matter on what day the beaches are over-run with people.	6/29/2021 1:02 PM
55	The public's experience on the days when the beaches are open is still directly impacted by the number of others they share the beaches with. Increasing the number of visitors at the beaches detracts from what makes this area special in the first place.	6/29/2021 12:44 PM
56	This is one of the last remaining unspoiled beaches. Public access should be strictly controlled with bused in guided tours only on specific days, for example 2 days a week, leaving the majority of time for the beach to recover. Public access that is not closely supervised always leads to trampling of the plants, trash, fire risks with smoking, etc, in the adjacent chaparral, etc. No private cars should be allowed, since the tiny road with only one way out would be a bad risk in case of fire evacuations.	6/29/2021 11:45 AM
57	I like solitude, or something approaching it.	6/29/2021 10:55 AM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey


58	Environmental impact would be the same	6/29/2021 10:43 AM
59	Any people on the beach scare away the wild life and reduce the time that they can hunt and nest on the beach, all people should be minimized at all times. That is what makes HR special is that 80% of the time there is not one person on the beaches letting the animals live in the natural habitat. The more people you have the likely hood of animals like mountain lions bob cats and coyotes get to use the beach drops drastically. .	6/29/2021 9:43 AM
60	public access to the Ranch should be available every day, at least for some initial try period (2 years?) to assess what will actually be the impacts	6/29/2021 8:41 AM
61	I have faith in those that will visit. If there is no damage to plants, animal habitats, cultural sites and no littering, I think visitors should have access.	6/29/2021 8:30 AM
62	The beaches are already open to the public. Public access exists today.	6/29/2021 8:12 AM
63	To many people any time will destroy the natural habitat.	6/29/2021 8:10 AM
64	The amount of people should be solely dependent on what is right for the ecology and preservation of the area.	6/29/2021 7:47 AM
65	More people at once destroys the unique quality of the ranch, both in the moment and literally	6/29/2021 7:45 AM
66	It depends. The impacts of too many people on sensitive resources need to be understood. And the quality of the experience for visitors declines as the number increases. Keeping the numbers down at all times preserves both the resources and the quality of the experience.	6/29/2021 7:01 AM
67	It depends on how often it is open and what the max number is	6/29/2021 6:49 AM
68	Maintaining low density and small number of visitors is absolutely critical to preserving the character of the Ranch and sensitive coastal environment.	6/28/2021 11:49 PM
69	Depends on numbers on "open" days, but looks fine - and fair- from your pictures.	6/28/2021 10:23 PM
70	impact on beach wildlife	6/28/2021 10:19 PM
71	Delicate ecosystem, rare natural resource	6/28/2021 9:51 PM
72	It is the impact that counts and more people are exponentially more impactful	6/28/2021 9:43 PM
73	it should be open every day	6/28/2021 9:31 PM
74	This would not be the ideal solution for visitors or the environment. Daily access is the ideal solution. People should be able to hike in on their own schedules while plans are made to make access more equitable for people unable (or in most cases simply unwilling) to walk in.	6/28/2021 9:22 PM
75	It will be open EVERY DAY just like EVERY OTHER BEACH IN CALIFORNIA!!! WTF	6/28/2021 8:53 PM
76	There should never be more people.	6/28/2021 8:52 PM
77	This could lead to crowded beaches.	6/28/2021 8:32 PM
78	No more than 10 people per mile is appropriate to protect wildlife	6/28/2021 8:18 PM
79	There have to be daily limits. But in general if only certain days of the week are available for visitation, the number of people per day would need to be higher.	6/28/2021 7:53 PM
80	I would visit to experience a "wild coast" not a beach with other people. There are beaches to the North and South that I can visit too.	6/28/2021 7:46 PM
81	California beaches belong to the public, regardless of how much money you have. Each day and every day.	6/28/2021 7:16 PM
82	Natural resources of tide pools etc cannot be protected from large groups	6/28/2021 7:04 PM
83	The impact of "more people" will significantly effect the wildlife and natural environment whether or not it's spread out or limited to certain days.	6/28/2021 7:04 PM
84	"Every day" is too vague, as is "More people"	6/28/2021 7:02 PM
85	don't want the beach to be more crowded. just have it open every day	6/28/2021 6:55 PM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey

86	Should be open daily. No questions asked. Enough is enough of the privileged having all the privileges. AND I'M ONE OF THE PRIVILEGED!	6/28/2021 6:55 PM
87	Basic access, walking, biking, should be available to any number of people at any time, day or night. Just like in the National Forests and Parks	6/28/2021 6:40 PM

Q11 If access to the beach is limited to a few times per week, which photo above has the number of people that you think looks okay?


Answered: 274 Skipped: 31



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Photo 1	22.63%	62
Photo 2	0.73%	2
Photo 3	17.88%	49
Photo 4	1.82%	5
Photo 5	18.25%	50
Photo 6	6.93%	19
Photo 7	10.58%	29
Photo 8	21.17%	58
TOTAL		274

Q12 The conceptual access program was designed to balance the goal of providing public access to the Hollister Ranch beaches, as required by law, while also minimizing impacts to natural and cultural resources and maintaining the unique character of the setting. I think the conceptual program does a good job at balancing these goals.

Answered: 239 Skipped: 66



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Strongly agree	7.95%	19
Agree	33.47%	80
Neither agree nor disagree	17.15%	41
Disagree	16.74%	40
Strongly disagree	24.69%	59
TOTAL		239

#	PLEASE EXPLAIN YOUR ANSWER	DATE
1	You are making things too complicated, let the people drive in and park there's plenty of parking most days. Just limit the # of people and carry on.	7/6/2021 7:40 PM
2	impacts to natural and cultural resources are already happening	7/6/2021 7:01 PM
3	Independent access by bicycle or foot should be allowed at all times. I would accept a reservation system for automobiles. A shuttle as well if it makes economic sense.	7/6/2021 4:43 PM
4	I like the phased in development and the care paid to mitigation of possible damage	7/6/2021 3:29 PM
5	The conceptual access program appears to do a good job balancing the of providing public access while minimizing impacts of natural resources, depending on how it is implemented.	7/6/2021 3:12 PM
6	The law also requires the state to work towards the completion of the California coastal Trail, but	7/6/2021 2:01 PM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey

	I see no mention of SB 908, the Coastal Trail bill.	
7	beaches need to be available to all for our health and wellness of mind and body	7/6/2021 12:23 PM
8	In furthering a CCT completion the conceptual program has tried to discuss issues of resources and maintaining unique character for walkers, hikers and bicyclists. It is a difficult and complex issue	7/6/2021 12:02 PM
9	there really can be no balance with a portion of the population that don't care or have no investment in the equation	7/6/2021 9:52 AM
10	Is access not already allowed by way of the mean high tide line? This seems to be overstepping to provide "EASY" public access. Difficulty in accessing something special should not not be deemed not accessible. Public has access to the top of half dome, but it is hard, should we not build a staircase to the top to make it easy for those who find it too difficult?	7/6/2021 8:28 AM
11	A picture is worth a thousand words.	7/6/2021 3:43 AM
12	The conceptual plan does a great job of showing the importance of protecting natural and cultural resources and showing constraints and opportunities, but the inclusion of the specific initial numbers of hundred or more visitors per day are many times the current level of intensity of use/impacts and would significantly impact resources--potentially irreversibly. Furthermore, the inclusion of unguided driving, which is not safe or feasible in the mid-term, make the initial plan out of balance. Tailoring the number of visitors and ensuring guided access, however, would produce a good balance and build on the first 3 dozen pages of the conceptual plan, which are very well done.	7/6/2021 1:37 AM
13	I will be surprised if any real access comes of this. We need to treat this as a precious resource of open space and beauty. Balancing access with protection is key, maybe add an access point at Razor's and then walk in from that point would be the best option limiting numbers with parking spaces like at the day use at Jalama. I would keep the numbers close to the maximum which Jalama holds at the 3.2 mile mark, with rangers, parking and minimal infrastructure but no camping only day use. 6:00am- dark.	7/5/2021 4:38 PM
14	Coastal Access was circumvented in 1970. This was wrong to begin with in so many ways	7/5/2021 12:35 PM
15	The long term goals of the program do not adequately address the potential impacts of the proposed program.	7/5/2021 11:53 AM
16	i think the conceptual program has an agenda of public access and rest is bullshit	7/5/2021 11:22 AM
17	Too many people are proposed. The plan does not acknowledge that public access over private property constitutes an illegal taking unless just compensation is provided to property owners. What will be the compensation and where is the funding for it?	7/5/2021 10:43 AM
18	Access to visitors should only include shuttle based travel to the following beaches: Razors (mostly) and sometimes Drakes. All visitors should be required to return to the shuttle by 3pm for departure.	7/5/2021 8:26 AM
19	There has been a lot of thought regarding the roadway and coastal environment. Each beach has been closely studied as well as access and impact.	7/5/2021 6:36 AM
20	Allows visitors to walk, ride bikes, drive a car or take a shuttle. Protects coastal resources and private property rights.	7/4/2021 4:50 PM
21	Public access is daily, California has public NOT private beaches	7/4/2021 3:36 PM
22	Every possible way of allowing beach access is carefully and sensitively thought out to include all stakeholders. My favorite is the shuttle concept.	7/4/2021 2:32 PM
23	Strong effort to balance conflicting options.	7/3/2021 5:41 PM
24	There needs to be additional focus on supporting the California Coastal Trail.	7/3/2021 3:10 PM
25	This is such a beautiful area that a large population coming in along with the local owners could cause environment issues with pollution as well as human problems with one another getting along. Then there's the problem of automobiles and a tricky road to drive that can be dangerous. Maintaining that road will be costly as well.	7/3/2021 2:18 PM
26	Would want limited and controlled access	7/3/2021 12:57 PM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey

27	Not enough consideration of private cattle ranch	7/3/2021 10:53 AM
28	I looked at the documentation, and it was very thorough. I have been on the Ranch and surfed North and south of it for 40 years. The Beaches and land East of Gaviota are an excellent indication of how the public will treat the area and Beaches. They are in great shape and people are very respectful. I feel that the Ranch owners by wealth have restricted access and some access should be allowed.	7/3/2021 9:11 AM
29	The conceptual program seems totally focused on access but doesn't really address how to preserve the natural resources. Too many people at one time will permanently damage the natural resources.	7/3/2021 8:54 AM
30	You have to start somewhere and this seems reasonable.	7/3/2021 7:33 AM
31	what is being proposed seems fair and equitable for public/ranch owners	7/3/2021 6:56 AM
32	Guided access seems unlikely to satisfy many. People want to independently access their coastline and do their own recreational activities on their own timeline. Facilitating this should be the focus. I don't think equitable needs to mean easy access for all. This is a rugged and remote stretch of coastline, it should remain that. Everyone should have an equal opportunity to go there but it may not be easy or equally easy, just like our other public wilderness and remote public lands.	7/3/2021 6:28 AM
33	I am in favor of limiting access to SB County residents.	7/3/2021 5:30 AM
34	The conceptual plan is just trampling on the land owners rights (I am not a land owner on Hollister Ranch, nor do I get to drive on to their property) yet it is very easy to enjoy the beaches and surf for very little investment and a bit of planning , knowledge and desire anyone can enjoy the specia place.	7/2/2021 9:37 PM
35	There are a lot of factors	7/2/2021 7:47 PM
36	Public access now, just as everywhere else in California!	7/2/2021 7:10 PM
37	The Costal Commission and the County of SB have, for several decades declared in writing that the goal was to open 'The Ranch' for public recreational use. In context, that has ALWAYS meant from Point Conception (Governments Point) at the far west all the way back to RazorBlades to the east. Please explain why AB 1680 excluded Bixby (now Dangermond). Either open both or open neither.	7/2/2021 6:30 PM
38	Hollister Ranch beach should be managed like other beaches in California. I don't like crowded beaches any more than other people, but restricting access is creating second class citizens. If there are legitimate environmental/ecological reasons for limiting access, those limitations should be applied to all California beaches.	7/2/2021 6:21 PM
39	Just open up the beaches, stop pandering to wealthy, exclusive landowners. Conceptual nonsense! This is California, open the beaches to the public that owns all of them! It's time!	7/2/2021 6:20 PM
40	er the county or railroad are willing to take responsibility for trash left behind My beach has litter that has built up for 10 years. When I call the county they do nothing. I believe hollister ranch will be ruined if the public is not subject to huge fines for litter or destruction of environment.	7/2/2021 6:15 PM
41	There are two primary problems with the conceptual plan. The first is with the volume of people. I don't know if there has been a survey done for current and historical beach usage but I suspect that it is well under 100 people per day. Its probably under 50. The idea of bringing 500 people per day onto the ranch is completely ridiculous and would create huge environmental impacts as well as completely disrupt our community. Rancho Real is our lifeline and it cannot handle an additional 50-100 cars per day, let alone 250 cars per day as stated in the goals of the plan. Similarly ridiculous, is the idea that there would be general public access to all of the beaches that are strung out along the coast. The drive times listed in the report are optimistic. People get carsick on the winding roads. My wife and adopted daughter struggle to get to Bullito without feeling really nauseous in a car. I feel like this plan ignores the impacts. It frankly seems insane. I really thought the plan would focus on getting the public to one of the close-in beaches where they could then walk along the beach to other areas. Letting un-chaperoned folks go all the way out to Augustine and the west end of the Ranch is ridiculous and recipe for conflict with HR owners. Finally, the plan completely ignores the the costs of obtaining easments and purchasing private property on the Ranch for the public. There are many property owners (members of the HROA) whose property values that	7/2/2021 6:07 PM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey

will be significantly diminished just by the grant of the easments and purchase of HROA property. We are talking hundreds of millions of dollars. The hundreds of thousands of dollars from in-lieu fees isn't remotely enough. Where is the social/equitable justice in using that level of taxes to provide parking for Santa Barbara area surfers who don't want to boat in or ride bikes at low tide? I was really hoping that this wasn't an ends justifies the means exercise but it really seems like it. Just ignoring the costs of obtaining HR private property (the hardest part of the exercise) is going to set up everyone to be very dissappointed. Where are the questions regarding "how much general fund revenue would you be willing to dedicate to obtain limited access to HR beaches?" or "Would you support bond issuance to obtain limited public access to HR beaches?"

42	There does need to be a balance for a location that has so much intact cultural and natural resources. This plan hits this mark	7/2/2021 5:53 PM
43	The Conceptual Access Program does not allow for enough people, which I think can be allowed with good management practices. You have started the options at too low a number making this a trick question, implying that such a small amount of access is acceptable.	7/2/2021 5:47 PM
44	Tries to make everyone happy.	7/2/2021 5:43 PM
45	It seems to be realistically assessing the impact of the objectives.	7/2/2021 5:22 PM
46	The pubic needs and has a right to access. The land owners have a right to privacy. The area also needs protection of ESHA. The current plan seems like a good compromise IMHO	7/2/2021 5:20 PM
47	Seems carefully thought out --	7/2/2021 5:10 PM
48	Too few visitors means it's de facto exclusive and exclusionary; too many turns this location into a high maintenance public entitlement. Being there should be a privilege based on responsibility and conservation only -- not any aspect of economic or social class. Guided and monitored access will probably have to be based on a free lottery open to all CA residents who agree to visit following common sense rules.	7/2/2021 4:58 PM
49	I think the Coastal Commission is over stepping on individual rights without thorough review of the consequences to the residents and the environment.	7/2/2021 4:46 PM
50	I don't agree that the public should have access	7/2/2021 4:24 PM
51	This survey is poorly designed as you cannot judge opinion without a bias based upon limited access with any of the photos. Compare the photos to the beach levels at other local and state beaches.	7/2/2021 4:11 PM
52	The statement 'while minimizing impacts' acknowledges that there will be environmental impacts. Restoration mechanisms, if needed, should be added to the plan. Items that should be more fully addressed under the implementation steps are: CEQA requirements (currently glossed over with a 'may' be needed statement), resolution of liability concerns, and obtaining railroad crossing permits. A critical implementation step is the development of safety protocols to include fire evacuation, and other emergency needs.	7/2/2021 3:02 PM
53	considerations are balanced; but breakdown of specific costs are not addressed, which is a problem	7/2/2021 10:47 AM
54	The HR beaches should be open to the public, without restriction, every day. The beaches belong to the public, which has been denied access for far too long.	7/1/2021 4:33 PM
55	It is private land. The program mentions it very seldomly	7/1/2021 11:24 AM
56	doe not fit criteria of protecting resources	7/1/2021 10:20 AM
57	The plan to bring in 100 then 500 people is not is not balancing access with natural resources.	7/1/2021 8:01 AM
58	All impacts seem to be anticipated	6/30/2021 11:41 PM
59	It is really hard to visualize impact on the beach and the surrounding environment, including on property owners who live in proximity to the beachy. Guided groups of people can be really noisy and disruptive as can parties of groups of people, not associated with guided groups. Density of people on the beach is one of may factors. For example, a group of five people playing a boom box and beer pong can be disruptive and inconsiderate of other beach goers, the environment, and the property owners. Guided groups of bird watchers, on the other hand, probably less so.	6/30/2021 3:32 PM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey

60	The numbers proposed to start with and increase exponentially are way too large with such potentially destructive and dangerous impacts and consequences. (Fire, sanitation, safety, environment, security, etc.)	6/30/2021 2:28 PM
61	100 per day is not a fair balance to preserve the natural resources.	6/30/2021 12:46 PM
62	Too many elements of the conceptual plan are unsettled. Until the specifics are determined the quality of the plan can not be determined.	6/30/2021 9:06 AM
63	The public has access. It's a spot for the adventurous ...like the top of Half Dome.	6/30/2021 8:51 AM
64	the concept of starting with 100 guests per day gradually working up to 500 a day, I feel is more than the current environment on the ranch can sustain to keep it healthy. currently the ranch does not have 100 guests per day on average, and has not for decades. that is why it is still in a relatively pristine state, and the proposed number of people WILL compromise what is there today to the point of losing what is now preserved. I thought the powers that be wanted to keep the Hollister Ranch in its current state.	6/30/2021 8:42 AM
65	The access program does a good job of identifying different transportation options and the limitations of those options. It is clear from the access program that road safety is a big concern for any transportation option other than shuttles. However, allowing only shuttle access would not balance the goals of public access and preserving the setting. It would be too limiting on public access. What would be better is to construct a separate walking/ bicycling path adjacent to the road and then allow only shuttles on the road. This is the only way I see to provide sufficient access, maintain public safety, and the setting.	6/30/2021 7:57 AM
66	Appears to address the major concerns of access, safety, cultural sensitivities and ecological concerns.	6/29/2021 9:19 PM
67	There is no mention of access to the Hollister Ranch coast from the north or from the east. There is no mention of the California Coastal Trail or the fact that the ranch is one of the last and lengthiest impediments to a continuous coastal trail. There is no mention of successful coastal access programs such as Point Reyes (where cows and beach goers have coexisted for 50 years) Sea Ranch, San Simeon...	6/29/2021 9:16 PM
68	I think too much deference has been given to ranch property owners. The beaches belong to all of us and their exclusionary tactics are the reasons for this.	6/29/2021 7:46 PM
69	Bikes on that road will result in many accidents! No way! Letting people roam around, unsupervised, will result in fires, damage to the ecological/biodiversity (scaring off birds and other native animals), invasion of private property by those who won't obey the rules, human waste/excrement being left in places where porta-potties are not close enough, litter, garbage, wrecks on the road caused by those not familiar with it's dangerous narrow curves, and so on. I am adamantly opposed to any "individual" activities not supervised by a guide or at least taken to a specific restricted activity point by a shuttle.	6/29/2021 7:40 PM
70	Would like to see more emphasis on the California Coastal Trail	6/29/2021 7:38 PM
71	The beach access should not be limited.	6/29/2021 6:58 PM
72	I don't believe in any form of vehicular traffic. Make it a rustic trail on and off the beach and make it a permit process for access. No buses, no cars.	6/29/2021 6:17 PM
73	I read the document and attended the meeting. The conceptual program is very well thought through and comprehensive. Great job! Don't let the HR owner / naysayers get you down. Of course they are going to bitch and moan all the way to the end. Hang in there!	6/29/2021 4:52 PM
74	There has been no true & valid EIR study completed to properly develop an environmental sensitive plan. In addition, I have concerns with Chumash sacred sites and what are the Chumash tribal people requests? It seems the Chumash people should have the most influence and say as to what the HR access plan should be as this was their native land!	6/29/2021 4:05 PM
75	I feel the tail is wagging the dog. The HRHOA has no trouble accessing the beach, but somehow the public isn't capable? The HRHOA claim's to be stewards of pristine property, but has no problem with the state building a staging area outside the gates, but within the same ecosystem. A simple solution is to use the Boy Scout trail as was originally intended and agreed to.	6/29/2021 2:58 PM
76	It's a complicated situation, but I strongly agree that Chumash access and input be prioritized,	6/29/2021 2:29 PM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey

and that the remoteness and wildness is not to be developed even to the extent of the state parks.

77	We need to include the California Coastal Trail	6/29/2021 1:32 PM
78	The load of visitors envisioned in the program will completely change the character of Hollister Ranch.	6/29/2021 1:06 PM
79	The conceptual access program has identified and scored various options for phased public access to the ranch. The access methods and their scores seem reasonable and appear to be based upon an interest in balancing the competing interests at stake.	6/29/2021 12:47 PM
80	Although one of the key tenets is stated as respecting private property, many of the activities do the opposite, since the road itself is private property. Only guided tours/closely supervised groups will assure that public individuals respect the property, do not trespass, harm the cattle or wildlife, don't throw trash around, start fires by smoking etc. In addition, the safety of the public is also not fully addressed, although they mention the hazards from the cattle operations, road conditions, cliff landslides, they still are considering individual access: only closely supervised guided tours can circumvent these dangers. One danger that is not addressed at all is the danger from wildlife: wild boars and cougars are often on the beach.	6/29/2021 12:23 PM
81	If you give access to the public you will ruin the ranch. Also, it's all private property. So how are you going to get in? The public is allowed to walk in below the mean high tide line. That's the law.	6/29/2021 11:17 AM
82	Too much emphasis on access, which should be limited to protect the unique environment.	6/29/2021 10:20 AM
83	Public access is needed ASAP	6/29/2021 9:51 AM
84	The access program is trying to force way too many people per day on the natural resource and will ruin it. Look at Diablo canyon and their guided trails on The Pecho Coast Trail and how they allow ten people a day on a guided hike, this is much more in line with what should be done at the Hollister Ranch not 100-500 people like the access program suggests.	6/29/2021 9:50 AM
85	The conceptual access program seems to account for the importance of the physical and cultural character of the land over the peoples' demand for its use. My preference would be to treat it as a wilderness with access by permit for individuals and groups.	6/29/2021 9:43 AM
86	There is a lot of property between here and Santa Barbara that has no access either, so why aren't they being forced into something like this? This is complete nonsense. The beaches WILL BE DESTROYED by those allow access under this program.	6/29/2021 9:36 AM
87	No source of funding to pay for the public access infrastructure needed.	6/29/2021 9:23 AM
88	The Draft Document is well-written and contains lots of useful information. The document would benefit from greater detail about the cattle ranch-- how long it has been running, its balance sheets, etc. Also, what have been the concerns addressing biodiversity and cultural sensitivities on Ranch properties and beaches in the past and currently? I am aware that people had been driving on Ranch beaches until quite recently. Have dogs been allowed off-leash (without enforcement) to disturb, e.g. snowy plover nest sites? There was also no mention of the "surf culture"-- the harassment incidents involving non-Ranch surfers at Ranch breaks (some of which seems simply due to "locals" feeling entitled), the mysterious and continual malfunctioning of the Gaviota boat hoist etc.	6/29/2021 9:07 AM
89	More people cause more danger to the infrastructure and may scare the animals away including scaring horses and cattle. People would need to be greatly informed on the safety of the animals that already exist here as well as the importance of maintaining their natural habitat.	6/29/2021 9:05 AM
90	I would like to see a greater amount of detail in the Cultural and Tribal Resources section of the report. One paragraph seems awfully short for such an important area for the Chumash.	6/29/2021 8:49 AM
91	The flexible feature of the access is key. Generous public access is contingent on the civil behavior of the public.	6/29/2021 8:33 AM
92	Providing access to 100 persons per day (phase 1) would have a significant negative impact on the resources and unique character of the setting. Providing access to 500 persons per day (phase 2) is way beyond a reasonable number of people. The impact to the wildlife (shorebirds,	6/29/2021 8:26 AM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey

seals, etc) would be significant. This area is their "last stand" in Southern California. It would be shame to turn it into Disneyland.


93	The plan is not balanced, and extremely unrealistic. It provides no protection to private property owners, and is not remotely feasible given a multitude of existing conditions. The plan did not include days with extreme weather (imagine carrying a surfboard along the roads when the canyon winds are gusting 30+, or days with fog and zero visibility). The plan is also extremely unrealistic with the amount of daily visitors. There should be a 25 person daily cap. The plans in the draft plan are amusing however, they included everything but a Ferris wheel.	6/29/2021 8:17 AM
94	Access should not take precedent over preserving habitat.	6/29/2021 8:12 AM
95	It seems like the program is overly complicated. This beach should be open without overbearing rules and conditions.	6/29/2021 7:54 AM
96	I have concerns about the overall cost of the program. How much will access cost? And is there a point at which those State funds would be better spend on upkeep for other State beach facilities that are under-funded.	6/29/2021 7:53 AM
97	the program does not assess multiple aspects: sanitation, safety, impact on cattle operations, impact on beach wildlife, trash, etc.	6/29/2021 7:50 AM
98	I think the guided access is OK, but that independent, espeically vehicle based options, while not minimize natural and cultural damage.	6/29/2021 7:49 AM
99	There is a big gap between funding the resources necessary and the proposal.	6/29/2021 7:47 AM
100	The idea of building to a maximum number of visitors of 500 per day is absurd. The infrastructure required to do so would fundamentally alter the nature of the place. Furthermore, there is almost no discussion of protecting owners' property rights, which is one of the stated objectives. Finally, how will this be paid for? Gaviota State Park is closed much of the year for lack of funding. Do you plan to destroy the Hollister Ranch with infrastructure that will then not be used because there are no funds for operations?	6/29/2021 7:42 AM
101	Access does not mean letting this beautiful coastal area become overcome by a constant path of people who will likely introduce man-made disturbances. It appears a lot of thought has been given to the effects of numbers of people gaining access.	6/29/2021 7:26 AM
102	The unique character and resources are fundamentally at odds with large numbers of people (500/day!).	6/29/2021 7:15 AM
103	The Draft Program starts with the assumption that 100 people per day is the minimum and that will ramp up potentially to 500 per day. This assumption is made without regard to the impacts of 100 per day and without any clear explanation of how to monitor those impacts. If the beach resources and visitor experience only allows 3-5 people per acre , then the maximum daily total might only be 20-35 people.	6/29/2021 7:09 AM
104	It strongly favors the shuttle option and does not adequately consider the boat in option which is clearly the most feasible.	6/28/2021 11:54 PM
105	There are many very obvious contradictions.	6/28/2021 11:37 PM
106	Clear descriptions. Pros and Cons of options seem right.	6/28/2021 10:26 PM
107	Fails to protect rare natural resource and chumash interests. Money can be spent better for underserved groups in places with more ready access.	6/28/2021 9:54 PM
108	Access doesn't mean having to schedule a structured trip on a shuttle. Many of us who enjoy being out in nature don't enjoy being crammed on a shuttle with a bunch of other people. That is why we go to the beach and not Disney. Also, scheduled access doesn't work well when there is high demand. Try getting a campsite at one of our local beaches during the summer. It is impossible. They are reserved online 6 months in advance with no opportunities to get a first come first serve site. The one exception is the bike in site at Refugio. This is the only way possible to get a campsite on the Gaviota coastline during the summer without planning months in advance. How would a reservation system for day access of the beaches at Hollister Ranch be any different? It wouldn't. Access would be extremely limited. A major goal of the access program should be to allow people to hike in. In addition, if there is a daily quota, some spots should be reserved for walk ins. People should not have to plan months in advance to access a beach. That is not really access.	6/28/2021 9:46 PM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey

109	More emphasis on protecting environmental resources is needed.	6/28/2021 9:45 PM
110	I disagree with the need for Hollister to have access according to the program objectives. The great thing about wilderness is that it is wild, which is neither safe, equitable, nor inclusive.	6/28/2021 9:27 PM
111	It will be open to anyone at anytime during the day between sunrise and sunset just like every other beach in California!!!!	6/28/2021 8:56 PM
112	It mentions signage many times. That alone will destroy the unique character of the ranch. We own a parcel, we pay a ranch owners association fee of over \$2000.00 a month. Much of that fee goes into constantly maintaining the main road, that belongs to the HROA. We pay a lot to maintain that unique character you are so ready to come in and use to get to the public owned beaches. We pay to maintain the cabanas, the water, the trash, and pay for all the ranch employees, their health care, etc. we have volunteer fire department. Volunteer docents for guided groups that apply to come visit the ranch. We offer groups that conduct scientific studies. We find a way to live with the cows, for this is first a working cattle ranch. So I find your conceptual program is not needed. The requirements by law, if you look closely are already available for anyone that wants to come see the ranch if they apply to the ranch.	6/28/2021 8:52 PM
113	100 people per day is not a balance. With the cultural and environmental resources	6/28/2021 8:43 PM
114	It is comprehensive. Not sure if it covers entry from the water, i.e. by boat.	6/28/2021 8:40 PM
115	100 people a day (for two years as stated in your draft) and 500 people a day (after three years as stated in your draft) negates everything you say about preserving the integrity of this sacred place.	6/28/2021 8:34 PM
116	The work of the state is beyond horrible. Take last question for example...it is designed to lead to access over protection for wildlife and cultural resources. You're treating public like mannequins....	6/28/2021 8:22 PM
117	It is my understanding that non-Hollister Ranch residents will be managing the outside visitors. An outside resident, with little to no firsthand experience of how to maintain this habitat, can do nothing but destroy it. How can someone who has little understanding of this natural habitat keep it pristine. Your goal is nothing but to provide access, which is NOT required by law. All beaches up to the mean high tide line are public. However, all landing leading up to the mean high tide line is NOT. There is no law that says private property owners must provide access to the coastline. If you want to get to it, there are other methods such as hiking, boating, kayaking, etc. You simply want special treatment and to put another feather in your cap. IF this environment gets worsened, which WILL happen if you allow any more than a very small number of SUPERVISED visitors on at a time, you will have no one to blame but yourselves.	6/28/2021 8:22 PM
118	Very few people should be allowed on certain days under certain circumstances (docents) to protect the "wild" beach and the biological resources. There are many other uncrowded beaches on the Gaviota coast.	6/28/2021 7:49 PM
119	I think public access to the Hollister Ranch as it currently stands allows for perfect access. Come up to the mean high tide line and enjoy. If you want to come onto the ranch, by all means, please buy a parcel a 1/12th volunteer become a ranch hand or work the gate. This is private property and should stay that way.	6/28/2021 7:48 PM
120	I do not believe the program address safety and emergency response plans effectively for the proposed number of potential visitors to the Hollister Ranch	6/28/2021 7:47 PM
121	Guided tours are not enough. Open the access	6/28/2021 7:33 PM
122	Various "claims" on access are acknowledged the assessment of risk and cost seems realistic and unique areas are safeguarded	6/28/2021 7:08 PM
123	There's no way at "maintaining the unique character of the setting" by doing any of the proposed items. Shuttles, cars, bikes, walk-ons will forever change this sacred and sensitive setting, forever impacting wildlife and environment.	6/28/2021 7:08 PM
124	so many variables had to be considered. It is really good to know that Californians from every group have been able to put together all the bits and pieces of possible access to this site/	6/28/2021 7:03 PM
125	Public beaches need not be "protected" from impacts to natural or cultural resources by an artificial limitation on the number or timing of public access.	6/28/2021 6:47 PM

Q13 The conceptual access program includes a goal of providing equitable access. In order to do that, the program will make an extra effort to provide access to those that face the most barriers to visiting and/or enjoying this coastal experience. I support the program goal to provide equitable access.


Answered: 240 Skipped: 65



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Strongly agree	15.42%	37
Agree	36.25%	87
Neither agree nor disagree	18.75%	45
Disagree	14.58%	35
Strongly disagree	15.00%	36
TOTAL		240

Q14 To help ensure equitable access I support the following possible approaches:

Answered: 223 Skipped: 82



ANSWER CHOICES		RESPONSES	
Giving priority for group permits to nonprofit and community organizations that serve underserved and Title 1 schools (schools that have more than 50% low-income students).		39.91%	89
Giving priority for reservations to people that qualify for CalFresh (known federally as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program or SNAP).		3.14%	7
Giving priority for community shuttle pickup in northern Santa Barbara communities.		12.11%	27
Other (please specify)		44.84%	100
TOTAL			223

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
1	Do all these things it doesn't need to be limited to one	7/6/2021 7:40 PM
2	give priority to non-profit groups that support environmental protection, preservation and rehabilitation	7/6/2021 7:01 PM
3	There does not need to be "priority" because I support full-time independent access as stated above.	7/6/2021 4:43 PM
4	I don't believe that giving priority access to any one specific group ensures more equitable access.	7/6/2021 3:12 PM
5	All of the above, plus access to everyone.	7/6/2021 2:01 PM
6	There should be no priority - this is elitism.	7/6/2021 11:15 AM
7	I think all possible approaches are not going to be able to protect the environment or birds on the beach or migrating birds	7/6/2021 10:31 AM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey

8	Priority should be given to research and educational institutions. Hollister is unique and should be studied, not opened up and abused.	7/6/2021 8:28 AM
9	Priority for organizations that serve the underserved and Title 1 schools, WITH EMPHASIS ON THOSE THAT SERVE THE CHUMASH.	7/5/2021 5:48 PM
10	These priority access approaches cannot be fairly addressed/given without knowing what the actual access will be. Potentially the program is creating its own discrimination.	7/5/2021 11:53 AM
11	no public access on private property.	7/5/2021 11:22 AM
12	I disagree with basic idea.	7/5/2021 11:09 AM
13	How about this? Land access for visitors could only include shuttle based travel to the following beaches: Razors (mostly) and sometimes Drakes. All visitors could be required to return to the shuttle by 3pm for departure. What is missing in this plan is the fact that if people really want to visit the beaches, they can do so now via boat (which many non-HR owners already do). Making this too easy will ruin the experience for owners and even for those who have planned their lives around boating in when surf is good. If this is not appropriately thought out, the experience could be ruined just for the benefit of a small group of citizens who may not be as dedicated to protection. If one is passionate about visiting, they can do so by purchasing a small boat or making friends (or a deal) with someone who has one.	7/5/2021 8:26 AM
14	Access for all at a public beach	7/4/2021 3:36 PM
15	I do not believe it is fair to give certain groups priority because it stretches the goals out of reach of what an organization committed to implementing public access can achieve. Any special interest group would have capability to kill the project by demanding something that will not fit into the budget.	7/4/2021 2:32 PM
16	Giving priority to those that provide strong rationale for wanting to access the area.	7/3/2021 5:41 PM
17	Provide walking access by trail for the total length of Hollister Ranch.	7/3/2021 3:10 PM
18	Everybody doesn't need access to everywhere. Many other beaches with access already will do the trick.	7/3/2021 10:34 AM
19	No access should be granted.	7/3/2021 9:15 AM
20	I am not sure that priority access to some group is good for everybody. A selection process by the CCS would probably be most equitable.	7/3/2021 9:11 AM
21	Why can't I support all three?	7/3/2021 8:54 AM
22	I'm not in favor of giving any specialized priority. Simply open the beach to hikers and bikes and let people come as they may. Let's democratize the beach, not play favorites.	7/3/2021 8:34 AM
23	Giving access to everyone regardless of affiliation to the above named groups.	7/3/2021 7:21 AM
24	I don't know that anyone needs to be given priority, but it is good to provide options for some of the above groups who might have difficulty getting there on their own a way to do so.	7/3/2021 6:28 AM
25	I do not approve of "equitable access". People who have to drive are usually the ones who cause the most damage.	7/3/2021 5:30 AM
26	There is already access available. HR offers education passes	7/2/2021 9:37 PM
27	Open to all	7/2/2021 7:10 PM
28	Priority to groups that serve children, getting kids out into nature, regardless of economic status. (Ex. Nature Track).	7/2/2021 6:57 PM
29	Priorities should same as given to people with limited access across California.	7/2/2021 6:21 PM
30	Open it up for everyone, no prioritized groups and further layers of bureaucracy and rule. Let the myriad already existing programs and organizations provide transportation as needed for their clientele.	7/2/2021 6:20 PM
31	Giving priority to people that are willing to volunteer to help clean our beaches, creeks and outdoor spaces. One day of volunteer equals one day of access.	7/2/2021 6:15 PM
32	I support ALL of these options, another trick question which doesn't allow support of all but	7/2/2021 5:47 PM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey

	only one.	
33	Priority to individuals . I. Do not agree with prioritizing one group over another	7/2/2021 5:43 PM
34	Yes	7/2/2021 5:18 PM
35	Beach access that works like the rest of California is what I would like to see.	7/2/2021 5:15 PM
36	Making access available by reservations with a daily cap of 100	7/2/2021 5:10 PM
37	In supervised, limited numbers with docents.	7/2/2021 4:46 PM
38	None of the above	7/2/2021 4:24 PM
39	Lottery for surfer access On rotating seasonal basis	7/2/2021 4:19 PM
40	Public access	7/2/2021 4:16 PM
41	Neither. There is already infrastructure in place that would better serve the underserved. Ie hendrys beach and the educational room along with toilets and free parking. Also on a bus route. I believe that all people should have access like our constitution states.	7/2/2021 4:11 PM
42	I feel that priority to groups should be limited. I see access as being available to individuals rather than groups (to minimize impact) and that bicycle access would offer less environmental impact - though understandably problematic. Shuttle could be good option.	7/2/2021 7:42 AM
43	No priorities needed. Allow those groups to visit when they can and want to.	7/1/2021 6:16 PM
44	Why can't I choose more than one? I support all three, but I also believe that public access to the beaches should be unrestricted.	7/1/2021 4:33 PM
45	This is a very narrow and unexplained list of groups. There needs to be more description on what these selections entail. Of course having students come in from underserved schools would be equitable access. However the selection above does not specify that. It states organizations that serve this population. This seems like a round about way for people that prioritize ocean recreation, with ample means to access these tidal zones currently, and who work for non profits to have easier access.	7/1/2021 8:01 AM
46	The goal is admirable but the current HR managed access program has done this for underserved populations and is the perfect vehicle to be expanded to achieve this goal in a measured and reasonable way without causing so much potential harm.	6/30/2021 2:28 PM
47	Giving access to Native Americans whose historical homeland is encompassed in this area.	6/30/2021 12:46 PM
48	No discrimination. Do not identify any one group for special attention	6/30/2021 12:06 PM
49	The beaches at Hollister ranch are remote and potentially difficult to access. The groups listed above would be better served by providing access assistance to easier beaches to reach in both North and South Santa Barbara County.	6/30/2021 9:06 AM
50	Fix the pier and give people tours by boat. As a student in Santa Barbara County, I believe this would be the most educational and exciting way to experience the pristine beauty of Hollister Ranch.	6/30/2021 9:05 AM
51	Give priority access during the WEEK to nonprofit and community organizations that serve underserved and Title 1 schools. This will give schools a chance to visit during school hours while leaving weekends open for other public access. Non non-profit groups not associated with school could be given access at specific times on the weekend.	6/30/2021 7:57 AM
52	Give priority to shuttles	6/30/2021 4:36 AM
53	Priority to disabled communities and Native/indigenous people	6/29/2021 9:19 PM
54	Of course there should be equitable access, but It's a challenge contemplating it when at the moment there's no access at all for anyone.	6/29/2021 9:16 PM
55	This presupposes limits that are not yet in place. These groups could come every day with others	6/29/2021 7:46 PM
56	Giving an established percentage of reservations priority to reservations from groups such as the above	6/29/2021 7:40 PM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey


57	I don't support any of the options offered.	6/29/2021 7:17 PM
58	No limitations should be placed on accessing our California beaches.	6/29/2021 6:58 PM
59	Use the existing managed access program currently in place.	6/29/2021 6:50 PM
60	Any income bracket can hike a free trail. Make it a permit to sign up and make it free.	6/29/2021 6:17 PM
61	Give unlimited boat access to the general public	6/29/2021 5:30 PM
62	I am more inclined to support first come first serve type of distribution. Kind of like how it goes to get camping reservations or other reservations to areas which have restrictions.	6/29/2021 4:52 PM
63	It is obvious that higher volume use brings clear potential for environmental disruption, habitat degradation, and potential conflict with property owners. If a trail (hike/bike) is built that could be a good compromise in order to keep human numbers down to a level that is suitable for the beauty of the area.	6/29/2021 3:20 PM
64	It's a California beach. All should have access, none should have priority.	6/29/2021 2:58 PM
65	Giving priority to analysis of actual funding for acquisition, design, development, operation, management and maintenance of each aspect of the HRCAP (over the entire life of the program) so that the 2021 HRCAP update does not end up like (A) the same waste of time that the 1982 HRCAP was because it was unfunded in both planning and execution; (B) the the Gaviota pler which has been shut for decades; and/or (C) the El Capitan-Refugio State Park bike trail which has been in disrepair and falling off the cliff for at least the past seven years. Wishing without funding is a prelude to failure.	6/29/2021 1:47 PM
66	Open access to all. This will not get out of control. Compare with other beaches on the Central Coast	6/29/2021 1:32 PM
67	Work cooperatively with the Hollister Ranch Owners Association ("HROA") to enhance equitable access but only within the framework of the existing programs offered by the HROA for scientific and educational access.	6/29/2021 1:06 PM
68	There is no equitable access to public beaches now, and this would be a particularly challenging beach to start such a program. There are no special shuttles from outlying communities to provide free transportation to any public beach in the Santa Barbara area. Are there any state beaches where the reservation system prioritizes any group over another? If so, why should this beach be the exception?	6/29/2021 12:23 PM
69	you do understand there are snowy plovers that nest on this beach.	6/29/2021 11:27 AM
70	None. The ranch already has a managed access program and it works. This whole movement to open up the ranch is wrong and a waste of time and money. Plus it will ruin the environment. This needs to go to the Supreme Court. It comes down to protecting private property rights. Also, California has much bigger problems like the homeless issue. Let's focus on what is really important.	6/29/2021 11:17 AM
71	Open to ALL of the public including those above..	6/29/2021 9:51 AM
72	Keep it as it is now.	6/29/2021 9:36 AM
73	Equitable access in this case is challenging, as there is concern to preserve the natural environment and feeling of "pristine, undisturbed California coast-line"-- and "equitable access" might entail additional infrastructure-- such as rampways, toilet facilities, etc. This is a difficult balance to achieve. As an analogy, many of our hiking trails are "open to anyone", but do not provide for "equitable access". This is a tough one.	6/29/2021 9:07 AM
74	Scientists	6/29/2021 9:05 AM
75	I think a reservation system should not favor anyone. First come, first served.	6/29/2021 8:26 AM
76	None of these. The beaches are free, everywhere.	6/29/2021 8:17 AM
77	It seems like the program is overly complicated. This beach should be open without overbearing rules and conditions.	6/29/2021 7:54 AM
78	I don't feel priority is needed	6/29/2021 7:26 AM
79	Priority to seniors	6/29/2021 6:47 AM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey

80	Does this also apply to other state and county beaches? Seems to single out Hollister Ranch and the rationale and fairness of that should be scrutinized.	6/28/2021 11:54 PM
81	Don't feel anyone should be given priority.	6/28/2021 10:32 PM
82	None unless access is managed.	6/28/2021 10:23 PM
83	I support all of the above. However, this shouldn't be done at the expense of allowing unstructured access to citizens who are willing to bike or hike in. Systems that require planning (and often paying) many months in advance for access are highly inequitable. Many working people simply don't have the luxury of planning their leisure time months in advance.	6/28/2021 9:46 PM
84	sign ups like land trust	6/28/2021 9:42 PM
85	None	6/28/2021 9:27 PM
86	If you can walk or ride a bike, you can access the Hollister Ranch beaches.	6/28/2021 9:22 PM
87	No priorities!!!! Open the beach.wtf is this survey? A way to still keep people off their public property!!!!????	6/28/2021 8:56 PM
88	The Hollister Ranch already has a very good program with volunteer docents in place.	6/28/2021 8:52 PM
89	This survey only allows a person to make one choice here even though it says "possible approaches" (plural). I would check all three proposals but if I can only make one choice I go for the community shuttle.	6/28/2021 8:40 PM
90	Giving priority to very small groups of people who truly want to experience a pristine stretch of coastline regardless of social or economic status.	6/28/2021 8:34 PM
91	No public access. This area is a jewel that will be destroyed by public access. There are plenty of public access beaches. Why not preserve the last unspoiled bit? Most of the public have no respect for the coastline and will litter and destroy the habitat. You will regret this well intentioned but misguided effort.	6/28/2021 8:27 PM
92	Keeping state out of the process since you obviously can't manage even the plan much less implementation. God help the wildlife....	6/28/2021 8:22 PM
93	What a slippery slope to go down. Lottery open to all without any opportunity for people to game the system.	6/28/2021 7:56 PM
94	None of above	6/28/2021 7:43 PM
95	None of the above,	6/28/2021 7:41 PM
96	you bullshitters need to stop the charade warm and fuzzy crap will despoil get your right brain in balance with your left brain - you lunatics	6/28/2021 7:21 PM
97	Why should priorities be given to any particular group (other than school children or graduate students doing biological or zoological work here). That would limit the access of the tax paying public.	6/28/2021 7:03 PM
98	all of the above	6/28/2021 7:01 PM
99	Give all of us a break. Open it up in such a way that's inclusive. Daily. Organizations and individuals can obtain annual passes and that "number" may or can have limits. Or limit daily attendance by shifts or hours (7AM—1PM, 8AM—2PM, etc.)	6/28/2021 6:59 PM
100	The Hollister Ranch beaches are simply remote and should be treated like all remote public beaches. For those who have physical or financial or cultural issues that prevent them from accessing remote beaches is unfortunate but there are many urban beaches in the State that can and do provide enhanced access programs for the above mentioned categories of visitors.	6/28/2021 6:47 PM

Q15 If initially only guided access is available, I would want to visit the Hollister ranch beaches.


Answered: 237 Skipped: 68



ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Strongly agree	22.78%	54
Agree	25.74%	61
Neither agree nor disagree	18.99%	45
Disagree	16.03%	38
Strongly disagree	16.46%	39
TOTAL		237

Q16 What would make guided access more appealing for you? Select all that apply.

Answered: 231 Skipped: 74



ANSWER CHOICES		RESPONSES	
Guided access for recreational activities like surfing, body boarding, or sand castle building		23.81%	55
Guided access for educational tours on topics like tidepool critters, Chumash history along this coast, coastal geology, etc.		58.87%	136
Two-hour trip		16.45%	38
Half day trip (4 hour)		24.24%	56
Full day trip (6 hour)		24.68%	57
Trips designed specifically for kids and families		15.58%	36
Guided hiking and biking access		25.54%	59
Trips that include time to relax on the beach or in the ocean		32.90%	76
Other (please specify)		32.47%	75
Total Respondents: 231			

#	OTHER (PLEASE SPECIFY)	DATE
---	------------------------	------

Conceptual Program: Public Survey

1	I support INDEPENDENT access.	7/6/2021 4:44 PM
2	a access to individuals and small groups	7/6/2021 2:03 PM
3	None - I suppose it would be a necessary evil.	7/6/2021 11:15 AM
4	Unlimited time whenever the sun is up	7/6/2021 11:15 AM
5	non of these accesses appeal to me, none to them can protect the environment like it has been protected over the many years	7/6/2021 10:35 AM
6	The beauty of the beach is walking alone to a spot and going surfing by myself.	7/5/2021 4:40 PM
7	none	7/5/2021 11:24 AM
8	Public access	7/4/2021 3:38 PM
9	Time to take a walk along the shore, maybe allowing attendees to split up, break away, then meet back.	7/4/2021 2:35 PM
10	Trips that provide environmental education.	7/3/2021 5:43 PM
11	none	7/3/2021 12:58 PM
12	This should not be used as a recreational beach.	7/3/2021 10:35 AM
13	no access should be granted	7/3/2021 9:15 AM
14	I could support surfing and ocean access trips if the plan and the State addressed the liability issues.	7/3/2021 8:58 AM
15	I look forward to having access but due to its remote location I think most people will visit rarely, perhaps once every year or two.	7/3/2021 7:37 AM
16	Guided trips become all about the guide. They determine the experience. I want to be free to discover and explore on my own.	7/3/2021 7:22 AM
17	Almost nobody wants or needs a guide for recreational beach activities.	7/3/2021 6:29 AM
18	I would be unlikely to use guided access; it is a good way to manage groups.	7/3/2021 5:31 AM
19	Access is already available if your willing to put in a little work to get a huge reward, it is already legal to use the beach	7/2/2021 9:39 PM
20	Unguided, unrestricted public access to the beaches.	7/2/2021 7:29 PM
21	Open to all	7/2/2021 7:11 PM
22	Guided access for education already exists through the HR Conservancy.	7/2/2021 6:31 PM
23	No guided access. Educate me on the rules to protect nature. Police when necessary.	7/2/2021 6:26 PM
24	Strongly opposed to guided anything, defeats purpose of open access and is an oxymoron.	7/2/2021 6:22 PM
25	Have several classes of tours	7/2/2021 5:44 PM
26	I think the spirit of the law is beach access. This feels different from free access to the breach.	7/2/2021 5:17 PM
27	No guide	7/2/2021 5:11 PM
28	No access please	7/2/2021 4:25 PM
29	Guided access is a way for property owners to control the context of every visit.	7/2/2021 4:12 PM
30	surfing	7/2/2021 3:38 PM
31	Guided shore walks (hiking).	7/2/2021 3:05 PM
32	Access for surfing should be unrestricted. Most surfers don't like to operate in groups.	7/1/2021 4:36 PM
33	Guided access should be educational. These sensitive lands need to be respected and conserved and will only happen if education is provided. There are also multiple hazards	7/1/2021 8:05 AM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey

including cows/bulls, dangerous eroding cliffs, and it's remote location. If ocean/land recreation is desired,

34	surfing will have the demand. Owners predetermine location/times a given tour has access. No surf that day? To bad. Tour tickets issued by lottery only.	6/30/2021 8:58 PM
35	Open the coast to the public	6/30/2021 12:07 PM
36	A guided access boat trip.	6/30/2021 9:07 AM
37	Trip focused on environmental education and habitat preservation	6/30/2021 9:06 AM
38	currently on the ranch, if an owner has a "surfing" guest they need to be with that guest on the beach. a surfing guest cannot be unaccompanied on the beach.	6/30/2021 8:48 AM
39	Guided access alone is not sufficient public access for the long-term. For educational purposes, guided access in addition to public access would be beneficial.	6/30/2021 7:59 AM
40	guided trips that stop at all of the beahes so we can see them all	6/29/2021 7:42 PM
41	My experience in guided situations is that they more often than not fit the needs of the lowest common denominator and are limiting to those who are seeking a more intensive or sophisticated experience	6/29/2021 7:41 PM
42	You're kidding with that question right? Guided Access for surfing and fishing how is that going to work there should be no limitations to the access of the beaches in California.	6/29/2021 7:00 PM
43	There is already guided access available through the HROA.	6/29/2021 6:52 PM
44	Some education tours yes maybe, but the bulk of the access should be hard earned by hiking.	6/29/2021 6:19 PM
45	The potential to limit human impacts (garbage, fire, noise, etc)	6/29/2021 3:21 PM
46	Nothing. The suggestion of guided access to a public beach in California is a joke. That's particularly true at this public beach considering the history of treatment legal users have been subject to by the residents.	6/29/2021 3:04 PM
47	Guided access that is strictly limited in numbers (10 or less), restricted in number of days (one day per month), and restricted to trained docent educational tours on natural resources, preservation of habitat, and Indian history	6/29/2021 1:52 PM
48	See answer to #14.	6/29/2021 1:08 PM
49	guided trips to the beach and then allow independent access/visitation once on the beach	6/29/2021 12:48 PM
50	None. Please leave the ranch the way it is. The state needs to focus on better its existing state parks.	6/29/2021 11:19 AM
51	None of the above	6/29/2021 10:20 AM
52	Guided access is not a good option IMHO	6/29/2021 9:52 AM
53	Low tide beach walks. I've hiked many of the sections of the SB county beaches to explore. The Hollister stretch to Pt. Conception has always been impossible given the limited access.	6/29/2021 9:46 AM
54	stay out	6/29/2021 9:37 AM
55	Guided bike access will never happen, the roads are way too dangerous. Also, the roads are not public nor considered part of the public beaches. That plan needs to be tossed right away.	6/29/2021 8:19 AM
56	It seems like the program is overly complicated. This beach should be open without overbearing rules and conditions.	6/29/2021 7:55 AM
57	NONE	6/29/2021 7:43 AM
58	None of the above. Guides in this sense feels like "party guides" in North Korea.	6/29/2021 6:49 AM
59	Trips approved by the HROA. They exist	6/28/2021 11:50 PM
60	guided bike trip with beach time	6/28/2021 11:04 PM
61	Money can be better spent providing access to coastal resources easier to get to	6/28/2021 9:55 PM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey

62	Guided access is not really access. Many of us would like to be outside by ourselves.	6/28/2021 9:50 PM
63	Guide monitors beach activities but people don't have to stay with guide	6/28/2021 9:37 PM
64	If this didn't exist. I'm not 100% sure you understand what PUBLIC ACCESS means?	6/28/2021 8:57 PM
65	Group limited in size, e.g. to no more than 20 people.	6/28/2021 8:42 PM
66	Having spent 40 years on the HR none of these are appealing.	6/28/2021 8:36 PM
67	Keep the Ranch private	6/28/2021 8:28 PM
68	All trips of any kind should be guided. Are you deliberately trying to degrade the environment and endangered species? Question 15 is bias since it says "initially " Do you really intend to use answers to question 15??	6/28/2021 8:25 PM
69	I'm telling you this in an honest, non-threatening way. But if non-residents or their escorted guests try to surf these waters, it simply won't go down well. I'm not saying that as a threat; that is just based on decades of how localized surfing environments operate. Outsiders hoping to surf these lineups will have a welcome experience and they will be lucky to get a wave. That's just the honest truth.	6/28/2021 8:25 PM
70	I don't need a Guided Trip to access the place, I can go there anytime I want with my boat and that's the way I will continue to visit the HR.	6/28/2021 8:18 PM
71	I support the widest possible public access by whatever means can be provided. I would be happy with any of the visitor densities shown, but I much prefer photo #1. It's the public's beach. Let the public use it. Thank you for all of your dedication and hard work.	6/28/2021 7:33 PM
72	perhaps you should consider defining "guided" otherwise a completely meaningless question that will allow you nto provide your pre-determined answer	6/28/2021 7:23 PM
73	Opportunities for citizen science	6/28/2021 7:09 PM
74	Please don't limit access to the beach. It belongs to ALL Californians. All should have access, not just a few.	6/28/2021 7:06 PM
75	The concept of "guided access is in stark conflict with the concept of a public beach. Would you be suggesting that owners of land on the Hollister Ranch only be given access to our public beaches that front the Hollister Ranch by "guided" visits?	6/28/2021 6:50 PM

Q17 Thank you for participating in the survey. Would you like to stay informed? If so, please provide your name and email below:

Answered: 153 Skipped: 152

ANSWER CHOICES	RESPONSES	
Name:	100.00%	153
Email:	99.35%	152

#	NAME:	DATE
1	Karen Orso	7/6/2021 7:02 PM
2	thomas bliss	7/6/2021 4:44 PM
3	Travis Vail	7/6/2021 3:13 PM
4	Richard	7/6/2021 2:04 PM
5	Richard Charter	7/6/2021 12:52 PM
6	Jeanne	7/6/2021 12:24 PM
7	Linda Hanes	7/6/2021 12:03 PM
8	Elizabeth Farnum	7/6/2021 8:50 AM
9	Robert	7/6/2021 3:45 AM
10	John Manning	7/5/2021 5:50 PM
11	James McGann	7/5/2021 4:40 PM
12	David Auston	7/5/2021 3:43 PM
13	Christine Armstead	7/5/2021 12:36 PM
14	Julia	7/5/2021 11:55 AM
15	Tom REDwitz	7/5/2021 10:44 AM
16	John Vallee	7/5/2021 10:25 AM
17	Annette Winter	7/5/2021 8:29 AM
18	Lori Givans	7/5/2021 6:37 AM
19	Lydia Deems	7/4/2021 4:51 PM
20	Teresa Rankin	7/4/2021 3:38 PM
21	george johnson	7/4/2021 3:15 PM
22	Susan	7/4/2021 2:36 PM
23	Scott frazier	7/3/2021 6:08 PM
24	Ray Smith	7/3/2021 5:43 PM
25	Scott Benson	7/3/2021 5:20 PM
26	Ray Cook	7/3/2021 2:21 PM
27	Joanne Williamson	7/3/2021 2:16 PM
28	Judy Stapelmann	7/3/2021 10:55 AM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey

29	Deb Trauntvein	7/3/2021 10:29 AM
30	Kevin Smith	7/3/2021 9:13 AM
31	Burton	7/3/2021 8:35 AM
32	Bob Craig	7/3/2021 7:23 AM
33	Robert Byrnee	7/3/2021 7:00 AM
34	Jeff Phillips	7/3/2021 6:29 AM
35	Brad Hacker	7/3/2021 5:32 AM
36	Justin Welch	7/2/2021 9:40 PM
37	Michael Hirschbein	7/2/2021 7:49 PM
38	Philip D. Dracht	7/2/2021 7:43 PM
39	David Shearer	7/2/2021 7:30 PM
40	Carolyn Chaney	7/2/2021 6:59 PM
41	Darryl Genis	7/2/2021 6:32 PM
42	John Kavanagh	7/2/2021 6:26 PM
43	David Amenta	7/2/2021 6:22 PM
44	Edwin Quackenbush	7/2/2021 6:16 PM
45	Tim Fuhs	7/2/2021 5:55 PM
46	Kathryn Washburn	7/2/2021 5:49 PM
47	Dave	7/2/2021 5:45 PM
48	Charisse Cordero	7/2/2021 5:45 PM
49	John Bolitho, J.D.	7/2/2021 5:24 PM
50	Ken Palley	7/2/2021 5:21 PM
51	Callie Bowdish	7/2/2021 5:17 PM
52	Don Freeborn	7/2/2021 5:12 PM
53	Rob Briner	7/2/2021 4:59 PM
54	Dayna Jordan	7/2/2021 4:47 PM
55	Paul	7/2/2021 4:26 PM
56	Larry Crawford	7/2/2021 4:20 PM
57	Otto Wm. Stowe	7/2/2021 4:17 PM
58	Matt Twohey	7/2/2021 4:13 PM
59	Alynka Alcocer	7/2/2021 4:09 PM
60	Lori Sullivan	7/2/2021 4:01 PM
61	Andy Roach	7/2/2021 3:59 PM
62	Tanawilcox	7/2/2021 3:56 PM
63	Greg Bristol	7/2/2021 3:46 PM
64	Rob Egenolf	7/2/2021 3:40 PM
65	marc	7/2/2021 3:39 PM
66	Zachary Cantor	7/2/2021 10:49 AM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey

67	Heather Baroff	7/2/2021 7:44 AM
68	Brian Lunardi	7/1/2021 7:45 PM
69	Kris O'Leary-Hayes	7/1/2021 6:18 PM
70	Linda Locklin	7/1/2021 4:50 PM
71	Bob Keats	7/1/2021 4:37 PM
72	Andrew Zearbaugh	7/1/2021 2:54 PM
73	Peter Borneman	7/1/2021 11:26 AM
74	j Farberow	7/1/2021 10:23 AM
75	Bill Ferguson	7/1/2021 8:33 AM
76	Rebecca Lee	7/1/2021 8:05 AM
77	Axel Ted Johnson	6/30/2021 8:58 PM
78	Gail Johnson	6/30/2021 3:33 PM
79	Suzanne Rebstock	6/30/2021 2:31 PM
80	RoryShevin	6/30/2021 12:50 PM
81	john francis reid	6/30/2021 12:07 PM
82	antoine	6/30/2021 11:55 AM
83	robert lindsay	6/30/2021 9:07 AM
84	Maso Motlow	6/30/2021 7:59 AM
85	Erin Campbell	6/30/2021 5:09 AM
86	Frederick Mugler	6/29/2021 9:20 PM
87	John McKinney	6/29/2021 9:17 PM
88	John Brooks	6/29/2021 7:47 PM
89	Michael Brown	6/29/2021 7:42 PM
90	bill woodbridge	6/29/2021 7:42 PM
91	Carl Niffer	6/29/2021 7:19 PM
92	Greg Maine	6/29/2021 7:00 PM
93	Guner Tautrim	6/29/2021 6:19 PM
94	Randall Leavitt	6/29/2021 5:31 PM
95	Steven Reichel	6/29/2021 5:07 PM
96	Bob Ward	6/29/2021 4:54 PM
97	Bob	6/29/2021 4:08 PM
98	Annie Yakutis	6/29/2021 2:31 PM
99	Thomas D Schaefer	6/29/2021 1:53 PM
100	mike minky	6/29/2021 1:34 PM
101	Scott Putnam	6/29/2021 1:09 PM
102	Nick Bobroff	6/29/2021 12:49 PM
103	Cari Woolcott	6/29/2021 12:12 PM
104	Richard Woolcott	6/29/2021 11:19 AM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey

105	Larry Naritomi	6/29/2021 11:17 AM
106	Susan Rankaitis	6/29/2021 10:07 AM
107	Greg Thompson	6/29/2021 9:52 AM
108	Andrew Stull	6/29/2021 9:46 AM
109	Gary Clisby	6/29/2021 9:37 AM
110	Frank Long	6/29/2021 9:24 AM
111	Wendy Warren	6/29/2021 9:06 AM
112	bill menninger	6/29/2021 8:53 AM
113	Daniel Warren	6/29/2021 8:29 AM
114	Jeff Gill	6/29/2021 8:28 AM
115	Matt Roberts	6/29/2021 7:55 AM
116	James Brady	6/29/2021 7:52 AM
117	Fred Thoits	6/29/2021 7:49 AM
118	Rob Wright	6/29/2021 7:43 AM
119	Kevin McCarthy	6/29/2021 7:27 AM
120	Mark Robinson	6/29/2021 7:16 AM
121	Neill DeClercq	6/29/2021 6:58 AM
122	Michael McNamara	6/29/2021 6:49 AM
123	JT Holmes	6/28/2021 11:56 PM
124	Emily Schmid	6/28/2021 11:55 PM
125	Steven Williams	6/28/2021 11:05 PM
126	Dale Pavich	6/28/2021 10:48 PM
127	Bill Dobrenen	6/28/2021 10:35 PM
128	Jeff Kruthers	6/28/2021 10:27 PM
129	Allan Stewart-Oaten	6/28/2021 10:27 PM
130	Mark Sutherland	6/28/2021 10:16 PM
131	Joanne Yarema	6/28/2021 9:56 PM
132	Thomas Adam	6/28/2021 9:50 PM
133	Cherie Topper	6/28/2021 9:47 PM
134	Chris Hutchison	6/28/2021 9:41 PM
135	Terence E Dressler	6/28/2021 9:24 PM
136	Blake Jones	6/28/2021 8:54 PM
137	Melissa Wall	6/28/2021 8:53 PM
138	Beth Shevin	6/28/2021 8:45 PM
139	Susan Shields	6/28/2021 8:43 PM
140	Paul Kemnitzer	6/28/2021 8:36 PM
141	Kelly Cannon	6/28/2021 8:28 PM
142	Jeff Chamberlain	6/28/2021 8:19 PM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey

143	Harry E Antoniou	6/28/2021 7:57 PM
144	Foster Campbell	6/28/2021 7:48 PM
145	Stan Assrch	6/28/2021 7:45 PM
146	Noel Park	6/28/2021 7:33 PM
147	Bruce Matthews	6/28/2021 7:31 PM
148	Fuck You self serving Charaders	6/28/2021 7:24 PM
149	Nathana Lurvey	6/28/2021 7:09 PM
150	Shaindell J Graham	6/28/2021 7:06 PM
151	PJ Diamond	6/28/2021 6:53 PM
152	David Lown	6/28/2021 6:50 PM
153	Robert Hazard	6/28/2021 6:50 PM
#	EMAIL:	DATE
1	keolhg@msn.com	7/6/2021 7:02 PM
2	tbliss@earthlink.net	7/6/2021 4:44 PM
3	travis.vail@cbnorcal.com	7/6/2021 3:13 PM
4	rnichols@sonic.net	7/6/2021 2:04 PM
5	waterway@monitor.net	7/6/2021 12:52 PM
6	jeannezbeanne@hotmail.com	7/6/2021 12:24 PM
7	coastlinda@gmail.com	7/6/2021 12:03 PM
8	farnum.elizabeth@gmail.com	7/6/2021 8:50 AM
9	stratone@cox.net	7/6/2021 3:45 AM
10	jonman50@aol.com	7/5/2021 5:50 PM
11	jamesmcgann@yahoo.com	7/5/2021 4:40 PM
12	dauston@cox.net	7/5/2021 3:43 PM
13	armstead.christine@gmail.com	7/5/2021 12:36 PM
14	jzaratzian@gmail.com	7/5/2021 11:55 AM
15	tredwitz@nwhm.com	7/5/2021 10:44 AM
16	reef_magnet@yahoo.com	7/5/2021 10:25 AM
17	AWinter242@aol.com	7/5/2021 8:29 AM
18	lorigivans@gmail.com	7/5/2021 6:37 AM
19	lydiadeems@cox.net	7/4/2021 4:51 PM
20	TeresaJRankin@yahoo.com	7/4/2021 3:38 PM
21	surfonit@yahoo.com	7/4/2021 3:15 PM
22	susandianebrumm@gmail.com	7/4/2021 2:36 PM
23	lscottfrazier@aol.com	7/3/2021 6:08 PM
24	ray@eri.ucsb.edu	7/3/2021 5:43 PM
25	scott94501@gmail.com	7/3/2021 5:20 PM
26	serfcook@gmail.com	7/3/2021 2:21 PM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey

27	SUBSYS@AOL.COM	7/3/2021 2:16 PM
28	Jandjsb@gmail.com	7/3/2021 10:55 AM
29	tdr1213@aol.com	7/3/2021 10:29 AM
30	kosmith1@yahoo.com	7/3/2021 9:13 AM
31	at15@cornell.edu	7/3/2021 8:35 AM
32	Loganwc@cox.net	7/3/2021 7:23 AM
33	Logrider57@hotmail.com	7/3/2021 7:00 AM
34	Ljefe00@gmail.com	7/3/2021 6:29 AM
35	hacker@ucsb.edu	7/3/2021 5:32 AM
36	Jawdroppincustomz@yahoo.com	7/2/2021 9:40 PM
37	canyon2186@yahoo.com	7/2/2021 7:49 PM
38	pdracht@drachtlaw	7/2/2021 7:43 PM
39	davidshearer1956@gmail.com	7/2/2021 7:30 PM
40	Cchaney@sfsu.edu	7/2/2021 6:59 PM
41	Darryl@genislaw.com	7/2/2021 6:32 PM
42	jckands@yahoo.com	7/2/2021 6:26 PM
43	Dra354@yahoo.com	7/2/2021 6:22 PM
44	tubeshark@hotmail.com	7/2/2021 6:16 PM
45	Cojosurfer805@gmail.com	7/2/2021 5:55 PM
46	kathwash1@gmail.com	7/2/2021 5:49 PM
47	Dave_basso@yahoo.com	7/2/2021 5:45 PM
48	lambgram@yahoo.com	7/2/2021 5:45 PM
49	Ohtilob55@gmail.com	7/2/2021 5:24 PM
50	kpalley1946@gmail.com	7/2/2021 5:21 PM
51	cjbowdish@hotmail.com	7/2/2021 5:17 PM
52	dfreeborn@me.com	7/2/2021 5:12 PM
53	briner8397@gmail.com	7/2/2021 4:59 PM
54	Daynam4l@gmail.com	7/2/2021 4:47 PM
55	Pablosdog@aol.com	7/2/2021 4:26 PM
56	Lcraw35908@aol.com	7/2/2021 4:20 PM
57	ottostowe@yahoo.com	7/2/2021 4:17 PM
58	matthewgwright@gmail.com	7/2/2021 4:13 PM
59	alynkaalcocer@icloud.com	7/2/2021 4:09 PM
60	lorisullivan1951@gmail.com	7/2/2021 4:01 PM
61	laroach@pacbell.net	7/2/2021 3:59 PM
62	tanawilcox@gmail.com	7/2/2021 3:56 PM
63	buckwheat22148@aol.com	7/2/2021 3:46 PM
64	egenolf@gmail.com	7/2/2021 3:40 PM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey

65	marc@lifestyledesign.com	7/2/2021 3:39 PM
66	zmcantor@gmail.com	7/2/2021 10:49 AM
67	Lamunchkin@aol.com	7/2/2021 7:44 AM
68	Brianlunardi1@gmail.com	7/1/2021 7:45 PM
69	kris.olearyhayes@gmail.com	7/1/2021 6:18 PM
70	Linda.Locklin@coastal.ca.gov	7/1/2021 4:50 PM
71	rkkeats@earthlink.net	7/1/2021 4:37 PM
72	Azearbaugh@aol.com	7/1/2021 2:54 PM
73	Peter.borneman@gmail.com	7/1/2021 11:26 AM
74	ranchmanager@hollisterranch.org	7/1/2021 10:23 AM
75	fergs7376@gmail.com	7/1/2021 8:33 AM
76	rmclean320@gmail.com	7/1/2021 8:05 AM
77	axted@cox.net	6/30/2021 8:58 PM
78	gsjoh50@gmail.com	6/30/2021 3:33 PM
79	suzannerebstock@gmail.com	6/30/2021 2:31 PM
80	roryshevin@gmail.com	6/30/2021 12:50 PM
81	johnreidto@roadrunner.com	6/30/2021 12:07 PM
82	a.Descos@gmail.com	6/30/2021 11:55 AM
83	thisisroblindsay@gmail.com	6/30/2021 9:07 AM
84	motlowm@gmail.com	6/30/2021 7:59 AM
85	erinacampbell@gmail.com	6/30/2021 5:09 AM
86	Mugler@msn.com	6/29/2021 9:20 PM
87	john@thetrailmaster.com	6/29/2021 9:17 PM
88	johnbrooks69@gmail.com	6/29/2021 7:47 PM
89	msbrownsb@gmail.com	6/29/2021 7:42 PM
90	bill.woodbridge@verizon.net	6/29/2021 7:42 PM
91	Carl.nuffer@cox.net	6/29/2021 7:19 PM
92	gregmaine1@gmail.com	6/29/2021 7:00 PM
93	Orellaguner@gmail.com	6/29/2021 6:19 PM
94	rsleavitt@yahoo.com	6/29/2021 5:31 PM
95	reichelgaviota@gmail.com	6/29/2021 5:07 PM
96	wavehunter@gmail.com	6/29/2021 4:54 PM
97	bob@bobdornin.com	6/29/2021 4:08 PM
98	yakutis@pm.me	6/29/2021 2:31 PM
99	tdslaw@cox.net	6/29/2021 1:53 PM
100	mikeminky@gmail.com	6/29/2021 1:34 PM
101	sbripman@hotmail.com	6/29/2021 1:09 PM
102	nbobro00@hotmail.com	6/29/2021 12:49 PM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey

103	carichurch@yahoo.com	6/29/2021 12:12 PM
104	richwoolcott@gmail.com	6/29/2021 11:19 AM
105	ynaritomi@gmail.com	6/29/2021 11:17 AM
106	rankaitis@earthlink.net	6/29/2021 10:07 AM
107	GregT98@msn.com	6/29/2021 9:52 AM
108	andystull@gmail.com	6/29/2021 9:46 AM
109	gary@cfobts.com	6/29/2021 9:37 AM
110	Ftlong@pacbell.net	6/29/2021 9:24 AM
111	wendywarren@me.com	6/29/2021 9:06 AM
112	bmenninger1@gmail.com	6/29/2021 8:53 AM
113	zdwarren@hotmail.com	6/29/2021 8:29 AM
114	jeff.gill@cox.net	6/29/2021 8:28 AM
115	Mattr@ci.carpinteria.ca.us	6/29/2021 7:55 AM
116	edsafaris@gmail.com	6/29/2021 7:52 AM
117	fthoits@pacbell.net	6/29/2021 7:49 AM
118	rwright@greymountain.com	6/29/2021 7:43 AM
119	kmac1206@gmail.com	6/29/2021 7:27 AM
120	markkrobinson@verizon.net	6/29/2021 7:16 AM
121	Neilldeclercq@gmail.com	6/29/2021 6:58 AM
122	mmc18700pch@gmail.com	6/29/2021 6:49 AM
123	Jtholmes914@gmail.com	6/28/2021 11:56 PM
124	Erichdale@gmail.com	6/28/2021 11:55 PM
125	Stevenmwilliams99@gmail.com	6/28/2021 11:05 PM
126	graysondale@hotmail.com	6/28/2021 10:48 PM
127	billdobrenen@aol.com	6/28/2021 10:35 PM
128	jeff.kruthers@gmail.com	6/28/2021 10:27 PM
129	stewart@ucsb.edu	6/28/2021 10:27 PM
130	mtsutherland@hotmail.com	6/28/2021 10:16 PM
131	Gysurfs@yahoo.com	6/28/2021 9:56 PM
132	thomascadam@gmail.com	6/28/2021 9:50 PM
133	Cherie.topper@gmail.com	6/28/2021 9:47 PM
134	chutchison@alcolecapiatal.com	6/28/2021 9:41 PM
135	dressler2@cox.net	6/28/2021 9:24 PM
136	blake@blueotis.com	6/28/2021 8:54 PM
137	Vistadelosantos@yahoo.com	6/28/2021 8:53 PM
138	Theshevins@gmail.com	6/28/2021 8:45 PM
139	shields3033@aim.com	6/28/2021 8:43 PM
140	pabloteebbs@gmail.com	6/28/2021 8:36 PM

Conceptual Program: Public Survey

141	joesurf@charter.net	6/28/2021 8:28 PM
142	jeffch@charter.net	6/28/2021 8:19 PM
143	Harryant@yahoo.com	6/28/2021 7:57 PM
144	gofoster@cox.net	6/28/2021 7:48 PM
145	Stantheman13@earthlink.net	6/28/2021 7:45 PM
146	noelparkone@gmail.com	6/28/2021 7:33 PM
147	b.matt@cox.net	6/28/2021 7:31 PM
148	Nathanall@aol.com	6/28/2021 7:09 PM
149	shaing2@verizon.net	6/28/2021 7:06 PM
150	surfndabu@aol.com	6/28/2021 6:53 PM
151	david.lown@icloud.com	6/28/2021 6:50 PM
152	refugiohome@gmail.com	6/28/2021 6:50 PM