Cuyamaca Rancho State Park – General Plan

Public Meeting #3 – at Mission Valley Marriott "Cabrillo Room", November 12, 2013

Comment Cards and Letters Submitted at Meeting

#1

- The tree planting project cannot be omitted from the plan. To do so renders portions of the plan useless. Further it renders the entire process as untrustworthy. Include this function & be honest about what you're proposing to do.

#2

- The reforestation plan must be a part of the general plan. It affects a significant area of the park; it is a long-term effort so not including it is not appropriate. There are clearly some issues associated with this effort. As well it should have been subjected to an EIR under standard CEQA guidelines, not an emergency exemption from CEQA. Including it in the general plan would open up input from a larger group of people, esp. scientists

#3

- I'd like to see an overflow camping facility. I'd see it as a more primitive-type, open during the busy season. It could be part of, or separate from the existing campgrounds.

#4

- Put bike lanes in wherever possible for road cyclists.

#5

- Still need a horse camp at north end of park.
- Proposed staging areas too small not a good location.
- Too much preserve area
- Mountain bikes & horses don't mix on narrow east & west side trails
- I like Mike Curtis' idea for a new visitor center!
- Better access from Green Valley Equestrian Camp to south & east trails.

#6

- Thank you for presentation! I am a huge equestrian, I camp @ Los Vaqueros & Green Valley & often come for day use. I am concerned about our horse camps & horse trails. I want to make sure they stay accessible to us for now & for our future.

#7

- What is wrong with Paso Picacho group camp being used as a horse camp? New bathrooms & already re-doing the whole camp. Great trail access also --Front Country location)

#8

- Families with horses need an economical area to camp in the north. Green Valley does not count. This park is for the people to enjoy, yet you are blocking families from enjoying the park with their horses.

#9

- Los Vaqueros horse camp brings in $550.00/night. This is a very important horse camp. The only horse camp in the north end of the park. Tulloch ranch is no site for a horse camp. Los Vaqueros is the parks big money maker, keep it! Los Vaqueros does not need replacement. Tulloch ranch is unacceptable for horses.

#10

- I would like to see a horse camp at the upper north end of the park – much like the horse camp we lost in 2003. Lose Vaqueros is nice but too expensive for single use, nor was it designed for that. I would like to suggest Paso Picacho for a horse camp to replace what was lost. Integrate it into a horse camp like Green Valley falls.

#11

- Front Country Zone – Gateway –Hwy 79:
    - Equestrian staging area will <u>not</u> accommodate enough rigs to park for day use
    - Where do you intend to put horse camps since boundaries are continuous?
    - Tulloch ranch is <u>not</u> acceptable for a horse camp – no trails across 79, no water, & expensive to build
    - Proposed conference center/retreat to be built at Hual-Cu-Cuish – this is the same area proposed as a horse camp & was denied due to water/percolation issues
    - There is no space for an individual, <u>family horse camp</u> in the north end of park
    - Trail system needs <u>absolute guarantee</u> of continued existence
    - We feel equestrians are being pushed out of the park

#12

- My concerns as an equestrian are the relocating the day parking area along hwy 79 – too far from any trail loop access. Also converting some of the narrow trails to multi-use on east & west side are too narrow & curved to have horses & mountain bikes

#13

- There is a definite need for an equestrian camp in the north end of the park. Tulloch ranch is not an acceptable location. There is no trail access from Tulloch. The proposal to establish a trail connection with Anza-Borrego Desert State Park® still requires a rider to cross Hwy 79. Is that connection proposed to connect the Tulloch horse camp to the park trails?

#14

- Front Country Zone cannot accommodate enough equestrian rigs (4 is not enough) Truck & trailers take space.

- I would like to see a horse camp for individuals on the north end of Cuyamaca like the horse camp we lost in 2003 fire when many of us lost our homes. Equestrians feel we are being 'squeezed out.' If there is a north camp we cannot be too far from the trails. We do not want to be in the desert. Our equestrian groups have asked for Hual-Cu-Cuish as a day-/overnight-use for years. Corrals/water/shade is not as expensive as rebuilding structures. (Where is Tulloch ranch?)

#15

- We must have an equestrian campground in the north by the lake. Large equestrian day parking; trails need to be able to be maintained or slightly moved to keep open.

#16

- Too many/too much preserves – excludes camping

- Need better balance – recreation needs more weight – more space

- Horses are part of the history of stonewall mine. Don't move the MAU camp please

#17

- Site of Marty Minshall's house for a horse camp. If not, why?

- Everything in the park is PROTECTED! Why do we need "preserves" in the park that limit recreational use?

- MAU camp at stonewall is only occupied on weekends. MAU serves interpretive role to hikers passing by from the mine & lake. Park needs MAU at the north end.

#18

- I submitted this letter to the Park service after the meeting in May. The talking points referred to starts on page 10 of the handout from the May meeting.
- My main concerns regarding the current presentation is the loss of trails as they become blocked by downed trees etc.
- I would appreciate a response to my attached letter
- (Letter attached)