



---

Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park  
Administrative Draft  
Final Environmental Impact Report

SCH# 2006061092

January 2008



California Department of Parks and Recreation

### **General Plan Inquires**

The Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park General Plan was prepared by the California Department of Parks and Recreation, Southern Service Center. For general information regarding the document contact the Service Center at 619-220-5300, or direct correspondence to:

California Department of  
Parks and Recreation  
Southern Service Center  
8885 Rio San Diego Drive, Suite 270  
San Diego, California 92108

Attention: Santa Susana Pass State Historic  
Park General Plan Team

*Front cover: Santa Susana Pass State Historic  
Park overview from west, looking toward the  
railroad tunnel*



Santa Susana Pass  
State Historic Park  
Administrative Draft  
Final Environmental  
Impact Report

SCH # 2006061092



Arnold Schwarzenegger  
Governor

Mike Chrisman  
Secretary for Resources

Ruth Coleman  
Director of Parks and Recreation

State of California  
The Resources Agency  
Department of Parks and Recreation  
P.O. Box 942896  
Sacramento, California  
94296-0001

---



---

*Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park*

## **Table of Contents**

<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
GENERAL PLAN AND EIR	3
PLANNING PROCESS	3
JANUARY 2008 ADMINISTRATIVE DRAFT	4
CONTENT OF THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT	4
<b>Recommended Changes to the General Plan/EIR</b>	<b>5</b>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
INTRODUCTION	5
ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS	5
Effects Found Not to be Significant	5
Mitigation and Monitoring	6
Findings	8
Public Coordination	9
<b>Public Comment &amp; Response</b>	<b>11</b>
COMMENT SUMMARY	11
ISSUES AND MASTER RESPONSES	23
INDIVIDUAL COMMENT LETTERS AND RESPONSES	32
<b>List of Preparers</b>	inside back cover



---

*Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park*

## **Introduction**

This document presents the public and agency comments made on the July 2007 Preliminary General Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park (Park), along with responses to the points raised. The background for the public review and coordination of the General Plan/Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is summarized below.

### **GENERAL PLAN AND EIR**

On July 5, 2007, the California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR) released to the general public and public agencies the Preliminary General Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for SSPSH. In accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines §15087, a 45-day public review period for the DEIR was provided. The public review period ended August 20, 2007. During the public review period, comments on the July 2007 Preliminary General Plan/DEIR were received from public agencies and individuals. These comments addressed the components of the Plan, issues not directly related to the Plan but to CDPR existing operations, and the environmental issues evaluated in the DEIR.

The Plan reflects CDPR's dual mandates as the stewards of sensitive resources and the providers of educational and recreational opportunities. The protection of natural and cultural resources and regional linkages are key components of the Plan. The Plan includes goals and guidelines directed at biological and cultural resources, in particular the preservation of the historic Santa Susana Pass Stagecoach Trail, the preservation of scenic resources, recreation and interpretive opportunities, and facility improvements.

The Plan considers the small size, scenic rock outcroppings, and steep topography of Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park with regard to resource protection and the desired high-quality visitor experiences. It emphasizes the importance of long-term sustainability and the Park's importance as a regional linkage for wildlife, trails, transportation, and historic interpretation. It is acknowledged that achieving the stated vision of the Plan would be realized incrementally, as funding becomes available, and would be completed over time through public/private partnerships, future capitol outlay projects, and operational actions taken by CDPR staff.

### **PLANNING PROCESS**

The first step undertaken during the planning process was a thorough analysis of existing conditions and concerns. This analysis is contained in the Resource Inventory. A set of key planning issues was identified in consultation with the public and interested agencies and organizations. The identified issues include the appropriateness of various recreational activities, protection of historic and archaeological resources, protections of natural resources including the Park's biological and geological resources, aesthetics, the inadequacy of day-use, interpretive and overnight facilities, and trails. At the same time, information regarding the physical characteristics of Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park was collected and analyzed. Existing data and field studies were incorporated into

photographic and geographic information system (GIS) databases to help make informed decisions regarding environmental constraints to development. Significant rock outcroppings, biological resources, archaeological sites and the historic trails were identified and mapped.

The second step, which began with consideration of the CDPR Mission and Unit Classification as the broadest planning objectives, consisted of vision definition and implementation for the Park. A vision and declaration of purpose was developed that emphasized the Park's link to California's past and to its present natural features. Planning concepts, such as goals and guidelines, management zones, and potential development areas were developed to achieve the vision. Public input regarding the vision and the planning concepts was obtained during three public meetings and specific stakeholder meetings. The preferred plan was refined after incorporating public input.

The third major step in the planning process consisted of the environmental analysis, the consideration of alternatives, and public review. The Plan includes an EIR that identifies the potential environmental effects of the Plan, in accordance with the requirements of the CEQA Guidelines. The Plan establishes resource-specific management guidelines in order to become a "self-mitigating" plan, designed to avoid, reduce, or minimize the potential environmental impacts of proposed facilities to a less-than-significant level. Upon approval of the Plan, the Recommended Changes to the General Plan/EIR will be incorporated into the General Plan.

## **JANUARY 2008 ADMINISTRATIVE DRAFT**

This document presents public and agency comments received during the public review of the DEIR, along with responses to significant environmental points raised in them and recommended changes to the General Plan/EIR. The document is organized as follows:

**Chapter 1, "Introduction"** provides a brief overview of the proposed project, and describes the organization of the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR)

**Chapter 2 "Recommended Changes to the General Plan/EIR"** provides an erratum and necessary components of the FEIR for the final version of the General Plan/EIR.

**Chapter 3 "Public Comment & Response"** provides a summary of the public comments, a summary of the primary issues and master responses, and the public comment letters and individual CDPR responses.

## **CONTENT OF THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

The July 2007 Preliminary General Plan/DEIR, and this January 2008 Administrative Draft document constitute the Final EIR for the Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park General Plan/EIR.





# **Recommended Changes to the General Plan/EIR**

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **Page iv, Alternatives, Delete Second and Third Paragraphs and Add:**

Alternatives 1 and 2 and the No Project Alternative, are no longer under consideration upon completion of the January 2008 Final Environmental Impact Report and approval of the General Plan/EIR.

### **Page iv, add at end:**

#### **Final EIR**

The Preliminary General Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park was released for public review beginning on July 5, 2007 and ending on August 20, 2007. Please see the Public Coordination section of Chapter 4 for additional information. Additionally, a chapter providing a summary of all public comments, issues and master responses, and individual comment letters and responses is located in Appendix F (under separate cover).

Findings regarding potentially significant impacts and appropriate mitigation measures to Aesthetics, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geological Resources, Recreation, and Water Resources were made and are included in the Environmental Analysis, Chapter 4. All potentially significant impacts will either be avoided or mitigated below of level of significance under the General Plan/EIR. A Mitigation Monitoring Plan and Program is located in Chapter 4.

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **Changes to Table 1 “Location of EIR Required Content” to comply with FEIR**

Changes to Table 1 will be required to identify appropriate pages for the General Plan and the location of information pertaining to Findings and Public Review of the Draft EIR.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS**

### **EFFECTS FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT**

#### **Fire Hazard**

#### **Page 114, New Second Paragraph:**

Preventive management techniques will be employed to reduce the threat of wildfire. These techniques include increased patrols, brush clearance, and closure of the Park during extreme fire conditions. Smoking is banned in all back country areas as are all ground fires.

If constructed, the campground would be managed to greatly reduce the possibility of a wildfire ignition. Campfires would be restricted to the fire rings and managed on a three tired system. During high fire risk conditions campfires would not be allowed, during medium fire risk condition, only charcoal briquettes would be

allowed, and during low fire risk conditions, small campfires would be allowed but must be contained in the fire ring. Park Staff and camphosts would strictly enforce these rules. Weeds and brush would be kept down in the campground to greatly reduce the possibility of ignition.

In the unlikely event that any fire were to escape the fire ring in the campground, it would very quickly be detected by other campers, camphosts or park staff, reported and extinguished before it became a wildfire event. The campground at Santa Susana Pass SHP is proposed at Spahn Ranch, immediately adjacent to a road for good firefighting equipment access and not directly adjacent to homes.

## **MITIGATION AND MONITORING**

### **Page 116, Add to End of Section:**

Each Mitigation Monitoring Plan & Program for specific projects will comply with the overall mitigation requirements of the General Plan listed below:

Mitigation Aesthetic Resources: Design and review of proposed projects and activities shall consider potential effects to site-specific aesthetic resources including regional characteristics and themes, viewsheds, dark skies, and topographical, geological, cultural, and natural features. Design and construction measures that avoid, minimize, or mitigate these effects shall be incorporated into every project.

Mitigation Biological Resources 1: Prior to construction of facilities, potentially affected areas will be surveyed for the presence of special status species. Special status species found on a project site will be avoided to the fullest extent possible through project design, timing of activities, and implementation. If a special status species is detected within the area of potential impact, alternative sites will be considered, the area shall be flagged, and personnel educated on the sensitivity of an area and instructed to avoid it.

Mitigation Biological Resources 2: As much as possible, all project related activities located within the habitat of special status species will take place outside of their breeding season or season of greatest potential effect on survivability. If project activities cannot avoid the breeding season or season of greatest potential effect, CDPR will arrange for weekly surveys to detect any special status species within 300 feet of the work area (1/4 mile for raptor nests). If special status species are discovered within this area of potential impact, surveys will continue through the period of construction. If special status species are being negatively affected, construction activities will be postponed until the potential for negative effects has passed. Sensitive habitat areas shall be flagged and construction personnel shall be educated on the sensitivity of the area and instructed to avoid the area.

Mitigation Biological Resources 3: Any areas cleared or disturbed will be restored with native plant species known from the area, using locally collected material, and species that represent habitat composition for the sensitive species detected on site.



Mitigation Cultural Resources 1: Prior to any actions that have the potential to disturb the area of a possible archeological site, additional research and testing will be carried out to determine if buried cultural remains exist. Any new facilities will be designed and constructed to avoid archaeological remains to the extent practicable. If impacts to archaeological remains are unavoidable, then a recovery plan will be developed and implemented. A CDPR archaeologist will monitor those activities deemed to have the highest potential to disturb or damage buried archaeological remains to ensure that no historical or prehistorical resources are adversely impacted. If cultural remains are uncovered during any project activities, work will be stopped in that area so that the resource can be recorded, the nature of the deposit can be determined, and an appropriate protection or recovery plan can be implemented.

Mitigation Cultural Resources 2: Any proposed project will be reviewed for their potential to affect significant historical resources. All significant historical resources will be mapped, recorded, and evaluated to determine their eligibility for placement on the National Register of Historic Places. Projects will be designed and implemented to avoid significant impacts to potentially eligible historic resources in compliance with the *Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.

Mitigation Cultural Resources 3: Information about the importance of cultural resource protection will be incorporated as part of the interpretation and signage for Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park. For example, there will be signs directing mountain bike users to walk their bikes down the portion of Santa Susana Pass Stagecoach Trail that is very steep and subject to erosion or damage.

Mitigation Geological Resources 1: Any new facilities will be designed and constructed to follow and fit into natural contours, as much as possible, to minimize the amount of topographic change that is required. Significant rock features will be avoided.

Mitigation Geological Resources 2: All demolitions, grading, and excavations will be subject to the typical restrictions and requirements that address erosion and runoff, including the Federal Clean Water Act and National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES), which includes but may not be limited to silt fencing, sand bags appropriately placed during rain events, and an erosion control plan that uses native species known to occur in the area for revegetation. CDPR will use Best Management Practices throughout construction to avoid and minimize indirect impacts.

Mitigation Geological Resources 3: The General Plan/EIR goals and guidelines call for ongoing monitoring of impacts to geological resources, such as change in topography and increased erosion. Geological features, including rock outcroppings that characterize the Park, will be preserved and protected from significant impacts because of visitor use.

Mitigation Recreation Resources 1: The General Plan/EIR goals and guidelines call for an assessment of current and potential recreational activities for compatibility with the management zones. Implementation of these guidelines will address the relative distribution of the different types of recreational activities

and potential inherent conflicts, as well as specific mitigation and monitoring measures, in order to provide high quality outdoor recreation activities while preserving the integrity of the Park.

Mitigation Recreation Resources 2: CDPR will make available to the public alternative recreational activities that are compatible with resource protection in areas within the Park that contain sensitive natural and cultural resources.

Mitigation Water Resources 1: Before additional facility development can occur within the Park, potential impacts to water resources need to be addressed. Potential impacts to water resources, including availability of sufficient water for facility use, will be identified and addressed.

Mitigation Water Resources 2: In accordance with the General Plan/EIR goals and guidelines, any new facilities within the Park will be designed and constructed to avoid impairment of natural drainages. Impacts to streams and meadows from trail use and routine maintenance will be avoided or minimized.

## FINDINGS

### **Page 116, Add Following Mitigation and Monitoring:**

It is anticipated that the implementation of measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate potentially significant environmental effects will reduce negative impacts to a level below significance. Therefore, no Statement of Overriding Considerations will be required for the General Plan/EIR. If these measures cannot reduce potential negative impacts to a level below significance, the project will not be implemented. The following Findings have been made for environmental issues that were identified as potentially significant:

Finding - Aesthetics: Potential adverse effects from the construction of park facilities to aesthetic resources, including viewsheds, dark skies, topographical, geological, cultural, and natural features shall be mitigated below a level of significance through site design and appropriate use of materials.

Finding – Special Status Species: Potential adverse effects from the construction of park facilities or park operations to special status or sensitive species shall be mitigated below a level of significance through site design and through consultation and approval by a CDPR Environmental Scientist (biologist).

Finding - Habitat: Potential adverse effects from the construction of park facilities or park operations to native plant species shall be avoided or mitigated to a level below significance through site design and by using locally collected material, and species that represent habitat composition for the sensitive species detected on site.

Finding – Archaeological Sites: Potential adverse effects from the construction of park facilities or park operations to disturb the area of a possible archeological site shall be avoided or mitigated to a level below significance through site design and the approval of a CDPR Archaeologist.

Finding - Historic Resources: Potential adverse effects from the construction of park facilities or park operations to disturb the area of a historic resource shall be avoided or mitigated to a level below significance through site design and the approval of a CDPR Historian. Additionally, projects with the potential to



adversely affect potentially eligible historic resources will be designed and implemented in compliance with the *Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.

Finding – Existing Impacts to Cultural Resources: Although not a new impact under CEQA, existing potentially adverse environmental effects through visitor use to cultural resources will be addressed and mitigated below a level of significance under the General Plan/EIR. Information about the importance of cultural resource protection will be incorporated as part of the interpretation and signage for Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park. For example, there will be signs directing mountain bike users to walk their bikes down the portion of Santa Susana Pass Stagecoach Trail that is very steep and subject to erosion or damage.

Finding – Topographical Compatibility & Rock Outcrops: Potential adverse effects from the construction of park facilities or park operations to the Park's natural contours and scenic rock outcroppings shall be mitigated below a level of significance through site design and the minimization of the amount of topographic change that is required. Significant rock features will be avoided.

Finding – Erosion: Potential adverse effects from all demolitions, grading, and excavations for the construction of park facilities or park operations shall be avoided or mitigated to a level below significance through site design and be subject to the typical restrictions and requirements that address erosion and runoff, including the Federal Clean Water Act and National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES).

Finding - Geological Features: Although not a new impact under CEQA, there are existing potentially adverse environmental effects from visitor use to geologic features including rock outcroppings that characterize the Park. These features will be preserved and protected from significant impacts under the General Plan/EIR.

Finding – Recreation: Potential adverse effects from the elimination of existing trails have been avoided by providing alternative recreational activities that are compatible with resource protection in areas within the Park that contain sensitive natural and cultural resources.

Finding - Water Resources: Potential adverse effects from the construction of park facilities or park operations to water supplies, natural drainages, streams and meadows shall be avoided or mitigated to a level below significance through site design and the approval of the appropriate agencies with jurisdiction.

## **PUBLIC COORDINATION**

### **Page 117, Add to End of Section:**

The Preliminary General Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park was released, in accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines §15087, for a 45-day public review period on July 5, 2007. The public review period ended August 20, 2007. A chapter providing a summary of all public comments, issues and master responses, and individual comment letters and responses is located in Appendix F (under separate cover). Two petitions were received, with a total of 357 and 18 signatures respectively, and 17 copies of a form letter. The petitions and the form

letter opposed the project. A total of 56 individual letters were received. Of these letters, 30 were opposed to the project and 15 were in favor. Several of the favorable letters were opposed to the campground. The remaining letters did not express a position.

There were seven general issues raised primarily by adjacent property owners. These issues are addressed with master responses and include 1) the overall park development, 2) camping and wildfire danger, 3) park access, 4) traffic and parking, 5) vandalism, 6) resource protection, and 7) the Santa Susana Field Lab or other pollution. In general, the residents near Lilac Lane favor the Preferred Alternative as described in the General Plan/EIR, but the majority of residents on Jeffrey Mark Court, Andora Avenue, and Larwin Avenue did not like the Plan or how the Park is currently managed.



## **Public Comment & Response**

The Preliminary General Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park was released, in accordance with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines §15087, for a 45-day public review period on July 5, 2007. The public review period ended August 20, 2007. This chapter provides a summary of all public comments, issues and master responses, and individual comment letters and responses. Two petitions were received, with a total of 357 and 18 signatures respectively, and 17 copies of a form letter. The petitions and the form letter opposed the project. A total of 56 individual letters were received. Of these letters, 30 were opposed to the project and 15 were in favor. Several of the favorable letters were opposed to the campground. The remaining letters did not express a position.

There were seven general issues raised primarily by adjacent property owners. These issues are addressed with master responses and include 1) the overall park development, 2) camping and wildfire danger, 3) park access, 4) traffic and parking, 5) vandalism, 6) resource protection, and 7) the Santa Susana Field Lab or other pollution. In general, the residents near Lilac Lane favor the Preferred Alternative as described in the General Plan/EIR, but the majority of residents on Jeffrey Mark Court, Andora Avenue, and Larwin Avenue did not like the Plan or how the Park is currently managed.

### **COMMENT SUMMARY**

Below is a summary of the petitions, form letter, and separate comment letters received on the July 2007 Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park Preliminary General Plan/DEIR. This summary excludes many varied substantive comments in the interest of brevity. Each of these substantive comments is addressed with the master responses or individual responses to each letter in the following sections.

If a position or organization membership was not clearly stated in the letter, the position is not included in the summary. Most of the letters clearly stated a position, however, if not clearly stated but the intent was clear, the direction of the comments has been assumed. Lists of all the persons signing the petitions and sending the form letter is located at the end of the summary



---

*Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park*



**Public Comment Summary July 2007 SSPSH Preliminary GP/DEIR**

<u>CODE</u>	<b>Commenter/Membership</b>	<b>Position on GP</b>	<b>Specific Additional Comments</b>	<b>Alternatives</b>
<b>CL 1</b>	Assemblywoman Smyth	In Favor		
<b>CL 2</b>	Native American Heritage			
<b>CL 3</b>	Public Utilities Commission		Concerned about Ped/RR issues	
<b>CL 4</b>	SC Edison		OK but respect easements	
<b>CL 5</b>	Petition Jeffery Mark Ct./Larwin Ave.	Opposed	Park/Access/Camping/Safety Fires/Hazmat from Rocket Dyne Lab – Approx 160 households	
<b>CL 6</b>	Petition Andora Ave.	Opposed	Park/Access/Camping/Safety Fires – 14 households	
<b>CL 7</b>	Martin Simone (Law firm)	Opposed	Park/Access/Camping/Safety Fires – + 21 form letters	
<b>CL 8</b> <b>CL 8A</b>	Mr. & Mrs. Altmayer / Mr. &Mrs. Anderson	Opposed	Same as above – photos showing vandalism	
<b>CL 9</b>	Mary Barnhill	In Favor	Applauds conservation/ concerned about fire/ opposed to Alts 1 & 2	Preferred Alt. only
<b>CL10</b>	Robert Dager	In Favor	Historic Interpretation	
<b>CL11</b>	Laurie Dager	In Favor	Historic Interpretation	
<b>CL12</b>	Santa Ynez Band of Mission Indians		Statement of Interest in project and contact for tribe	



<b><u>CODE</u></b>	<b>Committer/Membership</b>	<b>Position on GP</b>	<b>Specific Additional Comments</b>	<b>Alternatives</b>
<b>CL13</b>	Scott Kosar	Opposed	Wildfire/hazmat/destruction of his community	
<b>CL14</b>	Miti Bogler	Opposed	Same as Petition #1	
<b>CL15</b>	Vicki Bouzos	Opposed	Same as Petition #1	
<b>CL16</b>	Adolpho & Christine Aguilera	Opposed	Same as Petition #1	
<b>CL17</b>	Maxine Fox	Opposed	Same as Petition #1	
<b>CL17A</b>				
<b>CL18</b>	Janice Hinkston	In Favor		
<b>CL19</b>	Timothy & Stephanie Carvalho	In Favor	Against Alt 2	Preferred & Alt. 1
<b>CL20</b>	Mary Ann & Norton Holstrom	In Favor		Preferred only
<b>CL21</b>	Ivy Shuman	Partially	Opposed to camping & road Development/ keep wild as possible	
<b>CL21A</b>		In Favor		
<b>CL22</b>	Edward Conna	Opposed	No campfires/leave alone/ in favor of restrooms	
<b>CL23</b>	Dan Dockry	Opposed	No Park – safety record poor	
<b>CL24</b>	John Perrodin	In Favor		
<b>CL25</b>	Cheryl High	Opposed	Against campground	
<b>CL26</b>	Penny Cook	Opposed	Fire/traffic/crime increases	

<b><u>CODE</u></b>	<b>Commenter/Membership</b>	<b>Position on GP</b>	<b>Specific Additional Comments</b>	<b>Alternatives</b>
<b>CL27</b>	Sharon Dabek	Opposed	Bio impacts/Fire danger/park needs Supervision/crime	
<b>CL28</b>	Freida Felbinger	Opposed	Same as Petition #1	
<b>CL29</b>	Fern Bloom	Opposed	Crime/Access/camping	
<b>CL30</b>	Susan Frazier	Opposed	Fires/parking/no need for campground or restrooms	
<b>CL31</b>	Mr. & Mrs. Freedman	Opposed	Fire Risk	
<b>CL31A</b>	Jason Freedman			
<b>CL32</b>	Evelyn Goldman	Opposed	Fire/ safety/vagrants/no restrooms	
<b>CL33</b>	Marquita Goldson	Opposed	Poorly policed/ Fire danger/crime	
<b>CL34</b>	Laura Graff	Opposed	Fire danger/open gates at Jeffery Mark Ct./ hole in closure that young people climb through	
<b>CL35</b>	Kenneth Gross	Opposed	Leave natural/creates jobs for certain Employees/fire danger/EIR flawed	
<b>CL36</b>	Glenn Hickman		Funding concerns/EIR questions/favors Habitat protection	
<b>CL37</b>	Jo Ann Jacks	Opposed	Fire/traffic/crime & vandalism	
<b>CL38</b>	Kurt, Janee, & Keira, Lowry	Opposed	Crime/vandalism	
<b>CL39</b>	Ruzbe & Kaezad Mehta		Vandalism/crime/need more rangers	



<b><u>CODE</u></b>	<b>Commenter/Membership</b>	<b>Position on GP</b>	<b>Specific Additional Comments</b>	<b>Alternatives</b>
<b>CL40</b>	James & Mary Melichar		Concerns –litter/vandalism/gangs-camping/Fire natural environment is a priority	
<b>CL41</b>	Robert & Jeanne Michel	In Favor	Alts 1 and 2 don't reflect discussions between neighborhood and park staff.	Preferred only
<b>CL42</b>	Linda Nelson		No camping/open access at Jeffery Mark Court/likes trail & interpretive plan/volunteers Requests CDPR & LAPD develop MOA	
<b>CL43</b>	Karl Partch	In Favor	Well thought out Plan & may help w/ social problems	
<b>CL44</b>	Ted Reiner		Concerns about Fire/crime/congestion – no parking or entrance on Jeffery Mark Court	
<b>CL45</b>	Joana Simmons		No camping/keep green	
<b>CL46</b>	Stacey Tarantino	Opposed	No development	
<b>CL47</b>	Kathy Taylor	Opposed	No development/dangerous for children/crime	
<b>CL48</b>	Virginia Watson	In Favor	Great for Interpretation	
<b>CL49</b>	Elizabeth Butler	Opposed	Homeless living in rocks/conflicts/some people in area don't respect parks- please don't change park	
<b>CL50</b>	Laraine Miller	Favors some aspects/opposes camping	Camping more appropriate to remote parks, not near residential areas/budget concerns	

<b>CODE</b>	<b>Commenter/Membership</b>	<b>Position on GP</b>	<b>Specific Additional Comments</b>	<b>Alternatives</b>
<b>CL51</b>	Margery Brown	Opposed	Same as Petition 1	
<b>CL52</b>	Zena David	Opposed	Traffic/pollution/crime/overcrowding – put facilities in areas further along Santa Susanna Pass	
<b>CL53</b>	Matt Cope	In Favor	Concerns about fire/budget/ Ranger	
<b>CL54</b>	Lara Candice Tate	Opposed	Campground/fire/budget	
<b>CL55</b>	Jim & Judy White	Partially Opposed	Some development OK – opposes campground/fire/transients/more info	
<b>CL56</b>	Randi Weiner	Opposed	Park is for the surrounding community/walks dogs/opposes campground	
<b>CL57</b>	Annabelle Whettam	In Favor	Keep the Park a charming break from too many houses and people	
<b>CL58</b>	Tom Walsh	In Favor, except for camping	No camping/condo owners make it hard for people to use Park/protect cultural resources/restrict to daylight hours	
<b>CL 59</b>	Walter A Mojica	Opposed	Wildfire Risk	

**\*Signatories & supporters of the Petitions and Form Letter are as follows:**

**PETITION SIGNATORIES**

**Petition 1 – Jeffrey Mark Court & Larwin Avenue**

Merryl Arbogast	Dorothy Z. Lillback	Kay M. Medlin
Thomas DeSimoie	Elizabeth Drellana	Linda Baker
Betty R. Weyler	Diana M. Crist	Richard T. Scully
Sharon Ponticelli	Ron Rodriguez	Theresa Scully
W. D. Ahderson	Daksha Patel	Kathy A. Nicolson
Mary Spotts	Joann More	Sean Hunt
Christine S. Ruiz Aguillera	Crinne Schnur	Beaumont Bacon
Amy Small	Eva Carpe	Andre Chimene
Laila Asgari	Raymond Winters	Joanna Thomas
Marlene Stewart	Mary Winters	Jodene Rice Bradley
Scott Kosar	Marilyn Firnett	Bradley R.
Maizie Reiner	Paul J. Firnett	Manette Cooper
Theodorr Reiner	Erica Stux-Shore	Bobert A. Cooper
Thomas Desimoie	Moti Bogler	Joseph Meyer
Merry Arbogast	Miriam Bogler	Locille M. Meyer
Bernard Doucet	Margery Brown	Charlene Martin
Jay R. Hall	Elaine Marchesano	Michael T. Anderson
Annie Trappey	Vera Zarutu	Denise G. Anderson
Anne G. Hillard	Julias Levine	Cameron Deshor
Brian K. Hillard	Sheryl Levine	Joyce March
Denise Blackwell	Donald E. Klempnauer	William March
Elaine Schings	Delores Klempnauer	Barbara J. Mattison
Rudy Schings	Pamela Reynolds	Nedra F. Belden
Arina Sloutsker	Craig Reynolds	Zena David
Alexander Kalinin	Harlene S. Stein	Joseph Lieberman
Olga Sloutsker	Howard Greitzen	Bernice Lieberman
Joyce Anbug	Steve B. Pyle	Vivian Warshaw
Joel Leach	Corrinne Pyle	Saul Warshaw
Antoinette Creckinto	Betty J. Cates	Raymond A. Martin



F. Blumber	Betty J. Harper	Robin Knight
U. Blumber	Arthur Rubens	Nancy R. Hard
Robert J. Hill	William J. Peters	Loretta Ress
Frances K. Soper	Barbara L. Peters	Ronald Anderson
Caroline S. Hand	Sarah Lewow	Imrie Anderson
Jay R. Hall	Donald J. Kelly	Lillian Proctor
Annie C. Hall	Barbara Kelly	Michelle Betts
Frances Nelson	Monika Kelly	Richard Betts
Doug Felbinger	Margo Burkhart	Brandy Betts
James R. Belden	Vicki Bouzas	Jeff Lewis
Yang Park	Linda Felbinger	Rebecca Caballero
Sharon S. Park	Jerry Lucera	Kathleen M. Bose
Jack H. Malchose	Teresa Lucera	A. Bose
Kenneth E. Barger	Sharon Dabek	Bernard Kesten
Suzanne J. Barger	Joana Simmons	Elizabeth Kesten
Carolyn G. Meyer	Bridget Nelson	Yakon Kesten
Freida felbwger	Joshua Nelson	Betty May Ward
Audrey Serafin	Phyllis Lieb	Marjorie R. Cass
Flora L. Uhlig	Joann C. Cerny	John E. Cass
Daniel Uhlig	Daniel Shaljjan	Rose A. Caranag
Melvin Hoffman	Deborah Derian	Brendan Cavanag
Diane Eisman	Ara Derian	Elagne T. Troute
Kevin Eisman	Teresa Fiore	Rose Mary Trosser
Donald Eisman	Angie Fiore	Barleara J. Mattison
Phyllis J. Umphres	Radhika Ghai- Singh	Lillian P. Murray
Walter Umphres	Harbir Singh	Robert R. Wright
Roberta L. Agor	David Arlen	Roger G. Cohen
Janice L. Seymour	Shelley E. Arlen	Sandra Cohen
Karen Derenale	Ezzat Pakseresht	Mark L. Schulstad
Jack Derenale	Georgianna Altmayer	Donna Hart
Daniella Derenak	Lorraine Anderson	Susanne Desboraugh
Rabun Bharper	James Liebeskind	Christ Desborough
Lillian Murray	Barbara Libeskind	Britney Desborough

Sandra Caomo- Garvin  
Howard Garvin  
Shedont Walter  
Deborah S.. Walter  
Mitchell A. Walter  
Pado Andre  
Jerry Ubalde  
Harlene S. Stein  
Kenneth L. Ryan  
Pauline Ryan  
Saman Seyedin  
Sepideh Seyedin  
Robert L. Hewitt  
Lisa D. Hewitt  
Victoria Rybalov  
Gennadiy Rybalov  
Gajinder M. Sood  
Shashi K. Sood  
Rekha Sood  
James R. Leach  
Claudia H. Leach  
Steve Koester  
Marilyn Anderson  
Marilyn Lawrence  
Ivan Lawrence  
Maxine R Fox  
Douglas L. Campbell  
Lourdes Molnar  
Mihaly Molnar  
Luis Sato  
Liting Hanson  
Maria Barclay

Kenneth E. Brandt  
Kay J. Brandt  
Lucille A. Campbell  
Bonnie L. Parker  
Stanley Niewiarowski  
Kathleen Niewiarowski  
Wanda E. Najera  
Lavs Najera  
Alexander Ralinin  
Arina Sleutsker  
Ellen M Taylor  
Leslie H Taylor  
Catherine Heselius  
Ralph Klein  
Pamela Noble  
Thelma Gonek  
Craig Amromin  
Lisa M. Spencer  
Liunel Frais  
Arnold Karp  
Rita Karp  
Barbara Hoffman  
Vicki Ahlers  
Helen K. Hewitt  
Adele C. Bobo  
Dan Dockry  
Marie Burdick  
Al Liebman  
Dean Vukovic  
Jill Zubiri  
Peter Vukovic  
James Metzzyer  
Sandra Philips

Jean Staub  
Jerry Staur  
Rpnnie Amromin  
Joel Amromin  
Dana Amromin  
Denna Lauritzen  
Kirk Evans  
Mary Ann Wertenberyer  
Ruth B. Albrecht  
Leonard Freedman  
Nancy Freeman  
Dorothy J. Weisinger  
Martiu Weisihger  
Rita Lorenz  
Joann C. Jacks  
Phil C. Jacks Jr.  
Nigel Kerr  
Sheila Kerr  
Aaron Bogenigk  
Sue Boenigk  
Peter Boenigk  
Anthony Butala  
Stephanie Butala  
Helen Blaskovich  
Richard Careri  
Stanley Durban  
Jan Broman  
Amber Boenigk  
Cristian Godinez  
Jerry Feinsten  
Shirin Mavandi  
Homayoun Yazdi  
Farhana Zareparsi





Loretta Ress	Candice Powell	Brian K. Hillard
John Choplin	Richard Stout	Denise Blackwell
Angie Fiore	Vittoria Stout	Vicki Ahlers
Teresa V. Fiore	Syed M. Murtaza	Alexander Kalinin
Mark L. Schulstad	Qamar Murtaza	Olga Sloutsker
Ame Marie Botezatu	Ayan Murtaza	Joyce Anbug
Elena Gota	Teri Mann	Janet Prezia
Iuliu Gota	Paul Mann	Diane Stephens
David B. Lillback	Chris Mann	Michael R. Stephens
Virginia A. Keeling	C. Timothy O'Meara	Jordan Stephens
Betty Lou Jablon	Mark Rochin	Jack F. Walchli
Jack H. Malchose	Siri Rochin	Nancy Walchli
Maxine Fox	Maria Barclay	Debra Elkayam
David Burton	Christopher Graves	Leeat Elkayam
Oris Burton	Bethany Hartshorn	Richard G. Bristol
Joy Burton	Nancy R. Hard	Donna Hart
Lynnzee Winters	Margaret C. Kandarian	Kazem Pirastehfar
Steven P. Winters	Vera Slack	Mehri- T. Pirastehfar
Satt Block	John Bobo	Azi- Pirastehfar
Charles Shobe	Jay R. Hall	Judy Shea
Deborah Derian	Annie Trappey	Arina Sloutsker
Dan Shaljian	Anne G. Hillard	

**Petition 2 - Andora Avenue & Roy**

**Rogers Estates**

Christopher Mrrahg	Marlene Stewart	Rick Conemac
Linda Lampert	Jacqueline Champlon	Mary De Silva
Boris J Lebid Jurtschyk	Michael Harris	Joe De Silva
Judith K Lebid Jurtschyk	Bob Mair	Les Lampert
Ronald Chasse	Amy Kenzer	G. & Christopher Murphy
Kathleen D. Saw	Diana Conemac	

**Form Letter Simone, Aguilera et al.**

Margi Edison

Jane Pahlman

Amy Kenzor

Diana Conemac

Kim Carperter

Clifford Laidlaw

Jacqueline Pachon

Karen McElhaney

Judy Lyttle

Joseph Chess

Bob Mair

Martin Simone

Peggy Dekom

Matthew Weintraub

Roy Rogens

Adolpho Aguilera

Christine Aguilera



## **ISSUES AND MASTER RESPONSES**

During the public review period for the Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park General Plan/EIR, many comments addressed the common subjects of: 1) proposed improvements in the Plan, 2) proposed campground and wildfire danger, 3) access to and increased use of the Park, 4) traffic and parking, 5) vandalism and crime, 6) natural and cultural resources of Park, and 7) pollution or hazardous materials. These comments are addressed by issue below followed by a master response prepared by the California Department of Parks and Recreation (CDPR). All individual public comment letters, the form letter, the first portion of each petition, and CDPR responses are available for review in the following section.

### **1) Public Comment - Proposed Improvements in the Plan Overall**

Public comment both supported and opposed the General Plan/EIR (Plan), as proposed. More individuals, including the two petitions and the form letter, opposed the Plan than favored it. Opposition indicated that campsites, restrooms and kiosks are not part of the natural environment, that such facilities are not needed, that CDPR does not have enough funding for the improvements, and that the local residents want development limited. Many of the local residents felt that their property values would be decreased and their quality of life adversely affected. Several comments supported the Preferred Alternative of the Plan but opposed Alternatives 1 & 2. Several comments stated that the developments would have a beneficial effect on their property. Additionally, several letters from the public suggested using neighborhood residents for volunteers.

### **MASTER RESPONSE 1 – Proposed Improvements in the Plan Overall**

CDPR shares the same appreciation and desire as the many Park users to preserve the spectacular scenery and landscape of Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park. This common interest was expressed by many participants at the public meetings held during the development of the General Plan/EIR. CDPR also recognizes the positive health and social benefits that stem from outdoor activities. The Preferred Alternative of the Plan combines elements from the three alternatives presented during the planning process to protect the resources that are appreciated by the public while providing continued public access and future interpretation at the Park. At this time, CDPR proposes to proceed with the Preferred Alternative and drop Alternatives 1 and 2.

Opposing comment letters and the petitions indicated that the development proposed in the Plan would adversely affect their property value, force people from their homes and result in a reduced quality of life. On the contrary, studies have shown that adjacent open space increases property value. CDPR recognizes that there are park users that currently interfere with the neighboring property owners' enjoyment of their property. This is a common problem with open space parks located on the urban fringe and is an existing issue. Additionally, Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park is an existing park that needs operational funding. CDPR will manage the properties under Park ownership according to established CDPR policies that include the protection of cultural and natural resources, daylight hours of operation, and dog leash laws.

The Plan does not proposed to acquire property through eminent domain. Instead, CDPR would only acquire property from a willing seller as new funding became available. Several areas could be acquired in the future that may have appropriate property for a visitor center, wildlife corridors, or additional trails and amenities. CDPR welcomes the opportunity to work with local volunteers at the Park for interpretive programs and resource protection.

CDPR has welcomed the public into the planning process for the General Plan /EIR and received substantial support for the plan from members of the public as noted in the public comment letters and comment letter matrix. CDPR has also received substantial opposition to the General Plan/EIR, including petitions. For the record, CDPR did not receive a petition with 600 opposing signatures. Please reference the Comment Summary above to note those individuals signing the two petitions and those that sent in the form letter. CDPR believes that the General Plan/EIR represents the best interests of the residents of California and proposes improvements that are consistent with its Mission. The opposing public comment did not specify how the EIR was flawed or how the General Plan opposes the CDPR Mission. The General Plan/EIR process included three public meetings and four stakeholder meetings, including a meeting with the Rockpointe Homeowners Association, to discuss their concerns and incorporate suggested changes where appropriate. Changes made in response to public input from these meetings include the downgrading of several proposed Gateway Access points to Secondary Access, the immediate access closure at Jeffrey Mark Court, and increased trail access for horses and mountain bikes.

The General Plan/EIR is the guiding policy document for the subsequent operation and management of the Park, as required by PRC Section 5002.2. It was developed to ensure that these operations are consistent with the CDPR Mission and the Park's Classification as a State Historic Park. The Plan proposes site locations for uses in appropriate areas. Very few improvements are proposed for the Park in order to be respectful of the Park's natural landscape, natural and cultural resources, and compatibility with adjacent land uses. The Park is primarily used for recreational trail access from a series of neighborhood trailheads and Chatsworth Park South, owned and operated by the City of Los Angeles. One existing trail access at Jeffrey Mark Court was closed at the request of the Rockpointe Homeowners Association, because the trail could be accessed from another nearby location. CDPR believes that the Plan balances the needs of future users with existing users and nearby residents. No new access points are proposed, instead, the Plan changes the facilities and focus for future public use at Park.

The Plan will have insignificant effects on traffic and parking on local streets because the Park's primary public access will be at two gateways, which have been limited to the area adjacent to Chatsworth Park South and the previous Spahn Ranch property at the northeastern boundary of the Park. Additionally, CDPR will investigate the potential for creating a Joint Use Area with the City of Los Angeles at Chatsworth Park South. Improvements adjacent to the Rockpointe and Jeffrey Mark Court neighborhoods will be limited to small parking lots (6-12 cars), restrooms and minor interpretive or regulatory signage. These improvements will not create a substantial increase in noise over the existing condition. Park staff



and the traffic consultant concur that access at the secondary access points will not increase traffic substantially because CDPR proposes few changes at those locations. Please refer to Figure 5 in the Plan to review the proposed access points. Table 5 in the Plan, the Reasonable Development Projection Matrix, represents the maximum facilities that could be built for the purpose of analyzing the potential environmental effects, but the actual facilities that may be constructed are likely to be less. For example, the matrix square footage total includes Visitor Centers in three possible locations, yet only one would actually be constructed. The preferred location will be evaluated in a subsequent project-level environmental document. Even at the maximum square footage, the amount of building space (all restrooms, maintenance facilities/operations, and visitor center) constructed under the General Plan/EIR would be about 18,000 square feet for the entire park. The Goals and Guidelines further ensure that these buildings would be located in areas that are less sensitive or intrusive on natural and cultural resources.

The Plan has placed these facilities in locations with few natural or cultural resources and where they would blend with the topography to minimize visual intrusion caused by the addition of small parking lots, restrooms, and other facilities. For example, the small parking lot was placed across from Jeffrey Mark Court because there is an existing easement road to the site and the topography allows room for a parking lot in that area with minimal grading. The Park's topography constrains the appropriate locations for parking lots to just a few areas. No new roads have been proposed through the Park but several existing eroded roads may be repaired to allow ranger patrols in some areas. Additionally, CDPR may repair, eliminate, or construct new trails as indicated in the General Plan/EIR. These park facilities are necessary for the public's health, safety, interpretation, and enjoyment of the Park and will help direct visitor impacts to areas that are less sensitive.

## **2) Public Comment - Proposed Campground and Wildfire Danger**

Many members of the public expressed concern about the proposed campground and its potential for increasing the risk of wildfire near their homes. Others indicated that park users ignore existing preventative signs and that by increasing the number of park users, wildfire risk to their homes will also increase. Neighboring residents indicated that their homeowner's insurance is hard to get or more expensive due to their proximity to the Park and its volatile vegetation. Neighboring properties have been evacuated due to wildfire in the Park and several were concerned about fire buffers and controlled burns within the Park. Many comments indicated that CDPR staff did not understand the fire risk at the Park due to site specific erratic winds and temperatures. The public comment also indicated that 24-hour patrol would be needed and that funding is already constrained. Other comments indicated that authorized campers would discourage the illegal campers that use the site. Still other comments indicated that the campground would adversely affect natural resources.

### **Master Response 2– Proposed Campground and Wildfire Danger**

Wildfire is a major concern in southern California including the area in and around Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park, particularly during Santa Ana wind events

when the natural vegetation is extremely dry. The Park has burned several times in the past, most recently in 2005. CDPR personnel, including staff working on the General Plan/EIR, were actively involved in the response to the wildfire in 2005. Wildfire danger is present in many other open natural areas in southern California. CDPR successfully manages several parks in areas where wildfire is a major concern. These parks include; Mount Diablo State Park, Gaviota State Park, Will Rogers State Park, Topanga State Park, Chino Hills State Park, Malibu Creek State Park, Crystal Cove State Park, and Cuyamaca Rancho State Park.

CDPR is very proactive in wildfire prevention and response. While CDPR is not a fire suppression agency, CDPR staff is trained to patrol for fires and put out small fires. CDPR works closely with the Statewide Emergency Management System (SEMS) on all fires. Life and property always come before protection of resources such as chaparral, sage, and open lands. Park resource staff will accompany firefighters to minimize damage to park resources primarily by identifying sensitive site locations to avoid, if possible, during firefighting efforts. Several comments noted that the General Plan/EIR was prepared by CDPR staff unfamiliar with the wildfire risk at the Park because they are based in San Diego. On the contrary, CDPR staff in San Diego, and all of southern California, is extremely familiar with wildfire risk. According to California Department of Forestry – CalFire (CDF) records, the most destructive wildfire in California, the Cedar fire, was located in San Diego County and several park staff lost their homes and all possessions to that fire in 2003.

Emergency personnel have improved their response and coordination since the massive wildfires of 2003. During the recent 2007 fires, CDPR worked closely with CDF and the Los Angeles Fire Department to support all fire fighting efforts and protect valuable historic structures from damage. At the onset of the fires, CDPR sent fire fighting personnel and equipment from parks statewide to aid in emergency efforts.

In parks where wildfire is a major concern, preventive management techniques are employed to reduce the threat of wildfire. These techniques include increased patrols, brush clearance, and closure of certain parks areas during extreme fire conditions. Smoking is banned in all back country areas as are all ground fires.

In nearby Malibu Creek State Park the campground is managed to greatly reduce the possibility of a wildfire ignition. Campfires are restricted to the fire rings and are managed on a three tiered system. During high fire risk conditions campfires are not allowed, during medium fire risk condition, only charcoal briquettes are allowed, and during low fire risk conditions, small campfires are allowed but must be contained in the fire ring. Park staff and camp hosts strictly enforce these rules. Weeds and brush are kept down in the campground to greatly reduce the possibility of ignition. The campground at Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park would employ similar management objectives.

In the unlikely event that any fire were to escape the fire ring in a developed campground, it would very quickly be detected by other campers, camp hosts or park staff, reported and extinguished before it became a wildfire event. The campground at Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park is proposed at Spahn Ranch,



immediately adjacent to a road with good firefighting equipment access, and not directly adjacent to homes.

Controlled burns and vegetation thinning are also used as fire management techniques in appropriate locations or conditions. CDPR is very careful about the use of controlled burns near all structures and often does not implement the practice in those locations. CDPR requests that all new developments outside of Park boundaries contain a buffer zone for fire prevention. The maintenance of such a buffer zone is the responsibility of the property owner.

Moreover, state park campers are not a likely source of wildfire. According to CDF data for statewide wildfires between 2000 and 2005, only 3% of wildfires were started by campfires, including illegal fires. 27% were started by equipment use, 10% by debris burning, 14% were undetermined, 13% were classified as miscellaneous, 14% were started by vehicles, 7% were started by arson, 5% by lightning, 2% each by smoking and playing with fire, and 3% each by powerline and campfire. Illegal campfires started the Altadena fire, the Griffith Park fire, and the 2007 fire at Lake Tahoe. The state's most destructive fire, the Cedar Fire, was started by a lost hunter hoping to signal for help. Several other major fires, including the Witch Creek and Harris fires of October 2007 were started by downed power lines. While the chance of another wildfire in Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park is high, the chance that it would be caused by a camper in a developed campground is remote.

Persons responsible for starting wildfires are held accountable for their actions whether it is intentional or accidental. Five persons were recently arrested in connection with the November 2007 Corral wildfire. It is important to note that the Corral wildfire was not caused by campers but rather by after hours illegal activity including an illegal ground fire in a remote area of Malibu Creek State Park. Despite staff shortages and in response to resident concerns, ranger patrols to the site of the fire had increased, increased citations were issued, and increased clearing of after-hours people from the site had been accomplished. The site had been patrolled by a ranger hours just a few hours before the fire was started. Nonetheless, given the recent damage caused by wildfires in southern California, wildfire management in all natural areas remains a key and highly sensitive issue. It should also be noted that privately held land or other open space lands may not be patrolled regularly.

Camping was included in the Plan because it is identified as a need both statewide and locally, please see page 84 of the July 2007 Preliminary General Plan/DEIR and the Resource Inventory. The proposed campground location at the Spahn Ranch is disturbed from past development and contains little natural or cultural resources. The site may also be used for a visitor center or as a staging area. When funding becomes available to construct facilities on the site, a project-level environmental review would be prepared and any natural resources that were impacted would be mitigated by resource enhancement elsewhere in the Park.

### **3) Public Comment - Public Access and Increased Use**

Many respondents, including those that signed the petitions, indicated that they do not want the Park opened to more people. They felt that approval of the General

Plan/EIR and the access points proposed by the Plan would increase Park use and damage not only the Park's resources but the quality of life for those that live adjacent to the Park's access points. There were several requests for elimination of existing access points into the Park and, also, several requests to reopen the closed access at Jeffrey Mark Court. Many requested that access to the Park be restricted to daylight hours.

### **Master Response 3 – Public Access and Increased Use**

CDPR owns and manages the Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park. As a statewide agency, CDPR maintains that the Park must be available to all users although park use trends show that local users will remain the primary park visitors. The Park was classified as a State Historic Park due to the statewide significance of the Santa Susana Pass stagecoach road and serves as an important link to California's past. It also serves as an important link for wildlife and as part of the "Rim of the Valley" trail. The General Plan/EIR allows CDPR to manage and maintain the Park's resources in a manner that would prevent damage to the Park's natural and cultural resources. CDPR does not propose any new access points into the Park in the Plan, but seeks to manage the Park's multiple access points in an appropriate manner. No Gateway Access, Visitor Center, or campground is proposed adjacent to neighboring homes on Andora Ave., Lilac Lane, Larwin Ave. or Jeffrey Mark Court. These facilities are proposed in locations near Chatsworth Park South or Santa Susana Pass Road, at the north end of the Park.

CDPR agrees that the Park's access points should be open during daylight hours only, except for the proposed camping area at the Spahn Ranch. The elimination of the existing public access at Andora Ave. and Larwin Ave., as requested by several public comment letters, would create an adverse recreational impact to the park users who currently access the Park at these locations and is not proposed in the Plan due to the request by other stakeholders to keep these locations open. The small parking lot near Jeffrey Mark Court will be accessed from Larwin Ave. along the Powerhouse Road easement. It was placed at this location because the topography closer to the entrance was too steep. CDPR would prefer to allow people to park within the Park than along the city streets outside the Park entrance. The small facilities proposed at neighborhood secondary access points would not create a substantial increase in noise over the existing condition.

CDPR disagrees that all Park entrances severely impact the Rockpointe condominium complex. At the request of the Rockpointe Homeowners Association, CDPR closed the public access at Jeffrey Mark Court. Further, many park users do not venture onto Powerhouse Road near the Rockpointe Condominiums. CDPR will endeavor to repair the fence at Jeffrey Mark Court. The gates at Jeffrey Mark Court will remain closed, except in emergency, unless the Rockpointe Homeowners Association requests a permanent opening for all public users. CDPR will endeavor to work with neighboring property owners regarding volunteer programs at the Park.





#### **4) Public Comment - Traffic and Parking**

Public comment addressed the inadequacy and condition of the existing streets to handle additional traffic generated by the Park. They felt that approval of the General Plan/EIR and future facilities would reduce parking available to homeowners, residents, and their visitors. There were concerns about drunk drivers and speeding and that the Park would encourage more visitors and traffic problems. Others did not want to see new parking lots. There was also concern that Park traffic on Devonshire Street would endanger children at two schools along this street.

#### **Master Response 4 – Traffic and Parking**

According to the independent traffic study (Appendix H) prepared for the General Plan/EIR, no significant traffic or parking impacts would occur with the implementation of the project. The level of service on all nearby streets would not change from the existing condition due to the implementation of the Plan and all proposed facilities in the Park. This finding is not surprising because the Plan proposed very little new development or facilities. Traffic increase in the area would come primarily from local population and housing growth which is not within the control of CDPR. Therefore, the Plan implementation would not cause the widening or realignment of any streets nor would it increase the danger inherent to children on the street at two nearby schools. Because the access at Jeffrey Mark Court was closed, park visitors should not be parking on the residential streets in the Rockpointe Condominium complex. The Traffic Study addressed a higher level of parking and development than was finalized in the Preferred Alternative. CDPR agrees that views of parking lots are less desirable compared to the undeveloped nature of the sites now. However, the parking lots at secondary access points are small (6 to 12 cars) and will allow cars to be removed from the residential streets, increasing the parking available to nearby residents.

#### **5) Public Comment - Vandalism and Crime**

Many comment letters and the petitions stated that the current vandalism and crime problems need to be addressed before introducing additional park users and facilities. These comments also stated that law enforcement will only go on the property if there is a major crime, that the area is poorly policed, and that they want appropriate park ranger and security responses. There was an expressed concern that CDPR does not have the manpower or funding for law enforcement at the Park. These letters addressed transients, after-hours partygoers, increasing numbers of vandals and delinquents, graffiti, and litter. Photos of vandalism in the neighborhood were also submitted. There was concern that an arson fire had been started, that the Park is isolated, and that resources were being damaged.

#### **Master Response 5 – Vandalism and Crime**

Although the majority of park users are law-abiding citizens, CDPR agrees that unsupervised parks located on the urban fringe can be attractive places for teenagers and others to hang out, use alcohol and illegal substances, and otherwise behave inappropriately. That is why CDPR Rangers and Lifeguards are trained and certified law enforcement officers. CDPR also acknowledges that while funding and recruitment for full-time rangers is limited, recently the Park was

allocated two staff positions. This is in addition to CDPR staff at nearby park units that are available in emergencies. The Park is already owned and managed by CDPR and it is not anticipated that the increase in visitors will be substantial due to new facilities approved in the Plan. An increase in park users is likely to occur with or without the approval of the General Plan/EIR due to the increase in population in the general area.

There is shared jurisdiction or concurrency of jurisdiction for serious crime. CDPR acknowledges that increased ranger patrols would reduce undesirable behavior and will work to improve ranger patrols in the area. However, additional ranger patrols will not completely alleviate undesirable behavior or the risk of criminal activities such as illegal campfires. CDPR utilizes volunteer patrols for information and assistance and such a patrol could be utilized at Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park to improve the CDPR presence at the site. CDPR will follow established policies for dogs at the Park. Dogs, if allowed within a State Park, must be on a leash. Trash containers that prevent animal access can be used to prevent animal dependency on human food and scattered litter from their incursions.

#### **6) Public Comment - Natural and Cultural Resources**

Several of the public comment letters complimented park staff on a well researched document that protects the resources at the Park. However, other letters questioned the adequacy of the EIR and/or felt that either cultural or natural resources would be put at risk with the implementation of the General Plan/EIR. Several letters also suggested that local volunteers could help with the interpretation of the Park's natural and cultural resources.

#### **Master Response 6 – Natural and Cultural Resources**

The General Plan/EIR identified appropriate locations and limited development for Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park. The implementation of any future facilities would be required to undergo additional, project-level, environmental review. This is in keeping with CDPR general plan process and Mission. If adverse impacts to natural or cultural resources could not be avoided, then these impacts would be mitigated or replaced as part of the project implementation. CDPR would not, in most cases, exterminate coyotes, despite potential conflicts with nearby residents or park visitors. If a rabid coyote or other problem animal were determined to be a danger, then it would fall under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Fish and Game.

Habitat modification or wetland enhancement would entail restoration or creation of additional habitat. It is not anticipated that the cowbird would need to be controlled in the near future because no least Bell's Vireo were noted in the riparian area. However, if it were to become necessary, then the cowbirds are trapped during the breeding season and released after it ends in September.

Santa Susana Pass State Historic Park was classified as a historic park to protect part of California's heritage. All projects must comply with Public Resources Code 5024 which ensures that work will proceed in a manner that reduces or eliminates potential adverse effects to cultural resources. The General Plan/EIR proposes to keep the mountains and stagecoach road in pristine condition in



keeping with the Declaration of Purpose for the Park (page 57 of the July 2007 Preliminary GP/DEIR). Additionally, CDPR hopes to work with volunteers to interpret the Park's natural and cultural resources for the public. CDPR historians utilized all references available to them through state and local libraries for the Resources Inventory but welcome additional historical information to document the Park's history.

#### **7) Public Comment - Pollution & Santa Susana Field Lab**

Several letters addressed concerns regarding the Santa Susana Field Lab site (also known as the Rocketdyne site) which is located within a few miles of the Park. Public comment also expressed concerns about pollution in general and dog and horse feces in particular.

#### **Master Response 7 – Pollution and Santa Susana Field Lab**

CDPR conducts public meetings and public review in order to learn more about a project area and the public's perceptions. The fact that the possible contamination of hazardous substances and radioactivity from the Santa Susana Field Lab site was raised as an issue early in the General Plan/EIR process enabled CDPR to address this issue on pages 114 and 115 of the General Plan/EIR. Please refer to this section for the discussion of soil testing. The Rocketdyne site is not located in the Park and no known pond was located within Park boundaries during the site studies for the Park. Additionally, it is not anticipated that any of the facilities or uses proposed under the General Plan/EIR would increase pollution at the Park because appropriate construction protocols would be followed and litter cleaned up. Dog owners are responsible for cleaning up after their pets. Horse manure, is generally allowed to decompose on trails but would be required to be cleaned up at an equestrian staging area, if constructed.