

CPOA

Coast
Property
Owners
Association

Post Office Box 59
Big Sur, CA 93920

Michael Caplin
President

Andy Nusbaum
Vice President

Charly Kleissner
Secretary

Laura Moran
Treasurer

Board Members:

Robert Carver
Richard Costigan
Sam Goldeen
Mary Ann Jardine
Bill Nye
Alan Perlmutter
Stephen L. Ryter

3/5/04

Aileen Loe, California Dept. of Transportation
District 5
50 Higuera Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 934-1-5415
Email: Aileen_Loe@dot.ca.gov
FAX: (805) 549-3077

Re: Comment on the draft Coast Highway Management Plan (CHMP)

Dear Ms. Loe,

Following are issues that the Coast Property Owners Association believes must be addressed in the CHMP before it is deemed final. To ensure their inclusion in the record, we have attached CPOA's detailed comments on the previous draft of the CHMP, many of which were either not addressed, or were addressed in a manner that circumvented their clear intent (please see Attachment A).

1. The CHMP must contain a map that shows the proper boundaries of the Big Sur All American Road corridor, with parcel-specific detail. The width of the corridor for aesthetic purposes must not exceed 400 feet. After a proper map is included, the CHMP must undergo a new public comment period. Federal regulations related to Corridor Management Plans state, "The corridor management plan must contain at least the following: (1) a map identifying the corridor boundaries and different land uses within the corridor." The regulations define the word corridor, "*Corridor* means the road or highway right-of-way and the adjacent area that is visible from and extending along the highway."

CalTrans has provided a map of the corridor that includes areas to the inland extent of watersheds. Part of Carmel Valley, all of the Carmel Highlands, and all of Big Sur is included within the "corridor". This includes areas that are neither visible from nor adjacent to the highway and is therefore not a proper boundary map. The CHMP must be reopened for public comment after it contains a proper boundary map, so people can know the area where the plan applies.

2. The CHMP must state that the CHMP is not a regulatory document, is not to be used by regulatory agencies for regulatory purposes, and give the reasons why. Coastal Commission staff and County planning staff have indicated intent to require permit applicants to show they have complied with the CHMP. The CHMP currently states that it is not a regulatory document, but fails to say that it is not to be used by regulatory agencies for regulatory purposes. The CHMP was not subjected to the CEQA process, is not subject to initiative or referendum, was written by people who are not answerable through the electoral process, and has not received the depth of public review that regulatory plans receive.

3. The CHMP must state that residents of areas through which the Big Sur All American Road passes will comprise the majority of the members of any future Byways organization, and must provide a means whereby the public may

replace members. The CHMP must provide for public participation in decisions by the Byways organization. Byways organizations throughout the United States are often grass roots organizations made up solely of local citizens. Federal regulations require that corridor management plans provide means to ensure continued public participation. Rather than leave composition of the successor Byways organization to the present CHMP steering committee, the CHMP must state that the new Byways organization will have a majority of residents of the areas through which the All American Road passes.

4. The CHMP must not contribute to the buyout of Big Sur, and must state that further acquisition of private land by public agencies is discouraged. The CHMP must state that private developments visible from the highway, such as homes and access roads, are not to be considered visual detractors, but rather are desirable expressions of the existence of the community. Necessary private entranceways from Highway 1 must not be prohibited. One third of the private land in Big Sur has been bought up by public or quasi-public entities since 1986. The buyout must end or the Big Sur community will eventually be no more. The CHMP presently expresses a bias against private land and homes visible from the highway. All such references must be deleted from the CHMP and supporting documents as they set up justification for further acquisitions, including purchase and demolition of people's homes. All references to funding sources for acquisition of land or interests in land must be removed from the CHMP. Instead of further acquisitions, the CHMP should encourage government agencies to provide incentives for landowners to use their land in a way that does not degrade corridor aesthetics, while retaining land in private ownership.

5. The CHMP must accurately state Highway 1 capacity, Level-of-Service, and use information. The CHMP misstates the capacity of Highway 1. The strength of a chain is determined by its weakest link. The capacity of a highway with no alternate route is determined by the segment with the lowest capacity. CalTrans misstates the capacity of Highway 1 by failing to include segments in mountainous terrain in its capacity analysis (basing capacity on the segment through Point Sur rather than the segment through Hurricane Point). The concern is that the Big Sur experience may be degraded by traffic congestion if the inaccurate figures are used as the basis for deciding when it is appropriate to market the area to encourage additional visitation. A further concern is adverse impacts on use of private property should capacity be exceeded.

6. The CHMP must state that the present informal and unstructured visitor experience will be retained. Big Sur is one of the few places of its kind where visitors are not over managed and controlled. The present informal experience was overwhelmingly supported by visitor comments when queried by CalTrans in a survey. Any interpretive program must be invisible to those who do not choose to participate. Gateway facilities at the north and south ends of the corridor are not needed or wanted. Informal pullouts should be retained as the preferred means for people to pull over and view the scenery. No formal viewpoints should be added (they require signs, railings, etc.).

7. The CHMP must state that before additional use of the corridor by bicyclists is encouraged, a study will be done to ensure the additional use will not result in lower capacity of the highway for use by motor vehicles. The CHMP must state that any bike path will be located on existing public land. The vast majority of the millions of visitors who come to Big Sur each year travel by car. Such a study would remove the risk of adverse impacts on motorists from increased use by bicyclists.

8. The CHMP must provide a plan to deal with gridlock on Highway 1, similar to policies proposed for the General Plan by the Big Sur and South Coast Land Use Advisory Committees. The Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan presently contains policies designed to deal with gridlock on Highway 1 if and when it occurs. At CalTrans's request, Monterey County deleted similar policies from the General Plan Update based on the understanding that the CHMP would address the issue. However, the CHMP does not address the issue. Gridlock must be addressed in the CHMP, or CalTrans must inform Monterey County to reinstate the language deleted from the General Plan.

Sincerely,



Michael Caplin
President, CPOA

CPOA

Coast
Property
Owners
Association

Ms. Aileen Loe
California Dept. of Transportation
District 5
50 Higuera Street
San Luis Obispo, CA 93401-5415

Re: Detailed changes to October 2003 draft of the CHMP.

Transmitted via email 12/21/03

Dear Aileen,

As requested, here are detailed changes to the October draft of the CHMP that CPOA believes are needed to address the concerns outlined in our letter of December 1, 2003.

To avoid confusion, the starting point for the changes below is acceptance of the Caltrans changes to the draft CHMP; only CPOA's changes are marked with strikeouts and underlines. Ellipses (...) are used to denote unchanged language not shown in a paragraph. Three asterisks (***) are used to denote one or more unchanged paragraphs that are not shown. The strategy table in the CMP should be changed to conform with changed text.

This paper follows issues in the order addressed in our December 1, 2003 letter.

Sincerely,
Michael Caplin
President

1. Clarify that the CHMP is not a regulatory document. The CHMP must make it clear to the reader that it is not a regulatory document and that other plans are intended to fill that role. Unfortunately, both California Coastal Commission staff and Monterey County General Plan Update staff have indicated an intent to require landowner compliance with the CHMP. The CHMP must therefore be crystal clear to avoid such misunderstanding, including providing rationale why the CHMP is not regulatory in nature. Numerous statements that contribute to ambiguity about the role of the CHMP must be changed.

a. Change page 15 of the CMP to read:

The CHMP is not a regulatory document, and is not intended to be used by regulatory agencies for such purpose. The CHMP has not been subjected to the CEQA process, and is not subject to referendum or initiative. The CHMP does not include "a map identifying the corridor boundaries" as required by Federal Highway Administration interim regulations for preparation of corridor management plans. Without such a map, landowners have not known if their land is included within the

corridor during development of the CHMP, hence whether they may be affected by its provisions. Conformance with the CHMP is intended to be voluntary on the part of landowners. The Monterey County General Plan and Big Sur and Carmel Local Coastal Plans are the regulatory documents governing use of land for portions of the corridor to which they apply. The preparation of the CHMP was developed not by any mandate, but rather as a good faith effort to address express long-standing issues in the corridor that affect a variety of stakeholders. The CHMP is applicable to speaks about a wide variety of activities along the highway. While many of the strategies and actions are within the Department's responsibility, there are others that rely on others for success. The CHMP does not impose requirements on any organization, agency or individual, rather it sets forward a vision and framework for decision-making that is inclusive and that results in improved interagency coordination. As shared ownership over decisions in Voluntary consideration of the CHMP by landowners within the corridor is a desired outcome of the planning CHMP effort, so will the responsibility for carrying out the provisions of the CHMP.

b. Change page 5 of the CMP to read:

Caltrans management activities along the highway corridor right-of-way are based in the public trust, informed by an understanding of the area's intrinsic qualities and undertaken in a manner that preserves, maintains and where possible, restores those qualities for all time.

The goal of the Coast Highway Management Plan is to provide Caltrans with a framework for restoring, maintaining and preserving the natural and a scenic character of the corridor highway while continuing to operate the highway in a safe and efficient manner. This goal recognizes that In a broader context the plan's development and implementation rely on a collaborative process to build consensus, address needs of multiple stakeholders while respecting communities and private property rights, and allow response to changing needs over time.

c. Change page 6 of the CMP to read:

The Department is fully equipped to operate... The CHMP also reminds ~~the various~~ Caltrans managers of the responsibility to keep the entire experience for the traveler in mind as well.

d. Change page 10 of the CMP to read:

The CHMP is a compilation of the major corridor issues with a corresponding set of strategies and actions. The strategies and actions will ~~direct~~ advise future Caltrans' decisions regarding further development and undertakings in the corridor. The CHMP also provides products and tools that will assist ongoing Caltrans management activities.

e. Change page 11 of the CMP to read:

~~This primary document provides the foundation for collaborative agreement about protecting important qualities and resources in the corridor while maintaining the highway's essential function as a transportation corridor. The~~ This document is

organized as follows:

f. Change page 12 of the CMP to read:

Best practices are those that benefit from ... The guidelines are intended as a reference for practitioners of various disciplines within Caltrans ~~as well as agency and as a suggestion for voluntary action by~~ community stakeholders within the corridor.

g. Change page 13 of the CMP to read:

This information resource will be widely available and would support Caltrans's decision making for highway-related activities and coordinated resource management activities along the corridor. ...

h. Change page 14 of the CMP to read:

The CHMP, which exists as the combination of... Features outside the highway right of way and Caltrans' authority are addressed to suggest voluntary action by community stakeholders ~~highlight the need for a coordinated effort to achieve the goals of the plan.~~ There is no intent, either implied or explicit, to change existing lines of authority or the jurisdiction or responsibility of any entity or organization over land use decisions or activities conducted on private or public property.

i. Change page 15 of the CMP to read:

2.5 Caltrans' Environmental Compliance

The CHMP will stand on its own as an overall approach for managing Caltrans's activities within the Highway 1 corridor. Corridor Management Plans are not subject to compliance under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The CHMP ~~is largely a program for environmental stewardship and is suitable for implementation without~~ does not require an accompanying environmental document (EIR) because it is not regulatory in nature; rather, compliance with the CHMP is intended to be voluntary on the part of landowners and land managers.

Individual activities and practices pertaining to ... ~~Therefore, the CHMP itself is also not subject to review under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).~~

j. Change page 16 of the CMP to read:

2.6 Caltrans' Environmental Streamlining

k. Change page 19 of the CMP to read:

The USDA Forest Service and the California Department of Parks and Recreation own and manage lands adjacent to the highway. Caltrans's Management management practices should be compatible with those of neighboring public lands. ~~Land acquisition, through easements or purchase, can be a component of highway repairs in these areas.~~

l. Change page 33 of the CMP to read:

~~The Big Sur Coast Highway Management Plan seeks to preserve, protect and, where possible, restore all of the area's important and highly valued qualities while ensuring the continued safe and efficient operation of the highway. ...~~

m. Change page 58 of the CMP to read:

- Avoid the accumulation of progressive changes within the Highway One right-of-way that degrade character

n. Change page 75 of the CMP to read:

~~Although Caltrans has no authority or responsibility for areas beyond the highway right-of-way, the CHMP provides a framework vision for collaboration among other public and private landowners and managers as well as resource agencies cooperation between Caltrans, public and private landowners, and the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary and other agencies, as Caltrans fulfills its role of maintaining the highway while protecting resources and streamlining environmental procedure. Two primary strategies for this subject are resource protection and environmental streamlining.~~

o. Change page 1 of the Guidelines for Corridor Aesthetics (GCA) to read:

~~These guidelines support the Big Sur Coast Highway Management Plan (CHMP) which seeks to establish a coordinated management approach to engender a cooperative vision for a 75-mile stretch of Route 1 extending from San Carpoforo Creek in San Luis Obispo County to the Carmel River in Monterey County (Figure 1).~~

~~The purpose of these guidelines is to provide direction and guidance for decisions that influence a vision for the overall aesthetic and visual character of the Highway 1 corridor All American Road along the Big Sur Coast. These guidelines are intended to provide a source of values and direction when actions are contemplated, proposed or undertaken in the corridor. The areas of focus range from highway construction, maintenance and operational practices to roadside features beyond the highway right of way and within the Byway corridor. Achieving the desired aesthetic along the corridor requires strong collaboration, will require engendering a spirit of cooperation and good will as conformance with this Plan is voluntary, and no single entity has authority over all decisions that can affect the visual quality corridor's qualities.~~

p. Change page 2 of the GCA to read:

~~Context Sensitive Solutions is fast becoming a familiar term ... Recognizing this, Caltrans has placed an increasing emphasis on this approach; its policy now encourages the pursuit of solutions...~~

~~***~~

~~The CHMP is Caltrans's response at a very local level to seek solutions for the long-term management of Caltrans's activities within this important coastal corridor area that balance mobility, safety, community values and the environment. The CHMP has been developed in partnership with agency and community stakeholders along the corridor. These *Guidelines for Corridor Aesthetics* seek to broaden a collective~~

understanding of stakeholder values and serve as a tool to guide future maintenance and management decisions by Caltrans. ~~Working together, the~~ It is hoped that other stakeholders within the Byways corridor will strive to preserve the essence of the scenic qualities in the voluntarily join in preserving corridor values while ensuring that the principles for a safe and reliable transportation facility are also upheld.

q. Change page 5 of the GCA. The County's definition for the critical viewshed is changing with the GPU, currently under revision. Moreover, the critical viewshed policy is not applicable to the CHMP, which will function as a Corridor Management Plan for the All American Road (the critical viewshed policy includes land that is neither adjacent to nor visible from Highway 1). All references to the County's critical viewshed policy should be removed from the CHMP. Many other policies in the LUP will be revised in the GPU. It is therefore imprudent to cite any County policies in the CHMP at the present time. If any LUP policies are included in the CHMP, it should be made clear that they are only cited for background purposes.

Monterey County Local Coastal Program [Underline in original text, no change to this line.]

The policies quoted below are taken from the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan (LUP), certified by the California Coastal Commission in 1986 and amended in 1996. The Monterey County General Plan update, underway as of this writing, will supercede and replace the LUP, and many policies will be revised. LUP policies are quoted in the CHMP for background purposes only, and quotation of policies is not intended to limit their future amendment. The CHMP is not a regulatory document and has no control over authoritative planning documents applicable within the corridor.

The Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan (LUP), ~~adopted as part of Monterey County's certified Local Coastal Program (certified in 1986, amended 1996)⁷~~, sets forth the following basic goal:

⁷~~The Monterey County General Plan update, underway as of this writing, may change the references to these numbered sections. For purposes of this document, the policies refer to the document certified by the California Coastal Commission in 1986.~~

⁸~~Critical viewshed is defined in the LUP as everything within sight of Highway 1 and major public viewing areas. The latter include turnouts, beaches and the following specific locations: Soberanes Point, Garrapata Beach, Abalone Cove Vista Point, Bixby Creek Turnout, Hurricane Point Overlook, upper Sycamore Canyon Road (Highway 1 to Pais Road), Pfeiffer Beach/Cooper Beach, and specific views from Old Coast Road as defined by policy 3.8.4.4.~~

r. Change page 8 of the GCA to read:

Streets & Highways Code Section 121 [Underline in original text, no change to this line.]

A commitment to Caltrans conforming with context sensitive solutions ~~at the state~~

~~level acknowledging the national significance of the route is also supported by legislation. Assembly Bill 2440 (Keeley) was signed by Governor Davis in 2002 and added Section 121 to the Streets & Highways Code to ensure that recommendations of the corridor management plan with regard to safety and aesthetics would be carried out. That statute provides that " a state highway that has been designated by the federal government as an All-American Road on or before April 30, 2002, shall be maintained and operated by [the California Department of Transportation] consistent with the recommendations for context-sensitive design standards relative to aesthetics and safety that are contained in the corridor management plan submitted to the Federal Highway Administration."~~

s. Change page 9 of the GCA to read:

These guidelines are intended to address aesthetics for the Highway 1 corridor along the Big Sur Coast, consistent with the route designations as both a State Scenic Highway and an All American Road under the National Scenic Byways Program. These guidelines support the Big Sur Coast Highway Management Plan (CHMP) which ~~has been~~ is an advisory plan prepared under the authority of the consistent with designation of the Big Sur All American Road under the National Scenic Byways Program.

The primary focus is on Caltrans's highway-related activities, namely construction, rehabilitation, repair and maintenance within the right-of-way and those conducted under the authority and responsibility of Caltrans. Features outside the highway right-of-way, ~~and likewise therefore outside~~ Caltrans' authority, are addressed to highlight the need suggest concepts for a coordinated effort to achieve the desired aesthetic and to encourage visual compatibility throughout the corridor that may be looked to by others to voluntarily help maintain corridor values. There is no intent with these guidelines, either implied or explicit, to change existing lines of authority and responsibility for land use decisions or activities conducted on private or public property. The CHMP, including these guidelines, is not intended to be used as a regulatory document.

These guidelines are intended to ~~promote express stakeholder values within existing lines of authority over decisions that could affect the visual quality in the corridor related to maintaining corridor qualities within existing lines of authority.~~ This document will serve as a tool for Caltrans to explore and promote flexibility in highway design where appropriate, and to demonstrate a commitment by Caltrans to solutions that are sensitive to the overall environmental and aesthetic context unique to this corridor.

Caltrans has the authority for all actions occurring within the state right-of-way. While most activities are initiated and undertaken by Caltrans, others may be authorized by permission. These guidelines are intended to address the full range of activities within the state right-of-way. This document is complementary to existing manuals and procedures for safe highway design and to incorporate the decision-making principles of context sensitive solutions. These guidelines do not supersede any established manuals, procedures or planning documents. These guidelines also do not set policy, but rather integrate look to existing policies ~~in a manner that can be interpreted to achieve the greatest compatibility.~~

t. Change page 35 of the GCA. The Historic District Map has not been included in copies of the CHMP circulated for public comment, and therefore should not be included in the final draft. Current Monterey County policy is to not recommend historic listing of property unless the landowner voluntarily agrees, and so it should remain.

One stretch of highway within the corridor contains a disproportionately high concentration of outstanding rubble masonry resources. Within the corridor segment known as the Partington Coast, the stretch from about one mile south of Partington Ridge Road to Grimes Canyon (MON-1-P.M. 37.5 to 42.0) possesses high scenic values that most effectively convey the rustic aesthetics of the Historic District (~~Attachment B, Map 2~~). In addition to the concentration of resources, it is also important because the setting and feeling – two aspects of historic integrity – remain largely intact. This four-and-a-half mile section of Highway 1, perhaps more than any other stretch, imparts a sense of historic time and place and provides a feeling of what it might have been like to travel this highway during the 1930s (Figure 16). Therefore, particular care should be taken by Caltrans within this area to protect these key aspects of integrity.

~~Therefore, particular care should be taken within this area to protect these key aspects of integrity, not only as they relate to individual historic properties, but to the transportation corridor as a whole, including the viewshed.~~

u. Change page 42 of the GCA. Given that the corridor width is not defined, it is inappropriate for this concept to apply to more than the highway right-of-way.

Wherever possible, fencing should not create barriers to wildlife crossing the Highway 1 ~~corridor~~ right-of-way.

v. Change page 44 of the GCA to read:

Commercial businesses, private establishments ... The issue of controlling signs beyond the right of way depends largely on the ~~effectiveness of coordination among all involved parties~~ degree of cooperation within the corridor.

w. Change pages 52-53 of the GCA. Given failure to define corridor boundaries, it is inappropriate for the CHMP to speak of standards on vegetation management for the entire corridor. This is especially so because the standards appear not to consider issues other than aesthetics (such as fire hazard) considered by the LUP and GPU. The section should clearly be limited to Caltrans's actions within the highway right-of-way.

The primary objectives of vegetation management by Caltrans along the Big Sur Coast are conservation and preservation of native habitat. Vegetation management, however, serves a range of purposes beyond maintenance of botanical diversity. These may include erosion control, traffic safety, cultural values and aesthetics, as well.

1. ~~For existing trees along the Highway 1 corridor~~ treatment of existing trees by

Caltrans within the Highway 1 right-of-way:

2. For planting new trees ~~along the Highway 1 corridor~~ by Caltrans within the Highway 1 right-of-way:

x. Change page 55 of the GCA. The CHMP is not a regulatory document and therefore can only require actions by Caltrans.

The provision of flexible options to enjoy the coast route must be considered at every juncture in Caltrans's highway corridor right-of-way management: planning, project development, design, construction and maintenance.

y. Change page 57 of the GCA to read:

In general, the development of urban-style monumental entry features is discouraged, as are other roadside residential improvements that result in dominant features visually incompatible with the character of the Big Sur Coast. Private owners should be encouraged to voluntarily remove, modify or remedy any such existing structures.

z. Change page 58 of the GCA to read:

The conservation focus in the corridor is a vision for simplicity. Highway 1 provides a focus of attention and Caltrans does have a large role in exploring solutions sensitive to the context. However, achieving the desired aesthetic will depend on ~~participation and commitment from~~ the voluntary cooperation of a wide variety of stakeholders. Inspiration for change with these guidelines is intended for all stakeholders to explore individual contributions to improve the overall corridor aesthetic.

2. Ensure the CHMP will not contribute to the buyout of Big Sur. The Big Sur community is struggling for its long-term survival in the face of sustained public and quasi-public buyout of private land. The CHMP must not encourage continuation of the buyout of Big Sur. All references to acquisition of private land and interests in land, and funding for such acquisitions, must be removed from the CHMP. Various subjective comments that express a bias against private ownership and residences must be eliminated.

The CHMP must conform with corridor management plan interim guidelines that require corridor management plans to contain "A strategy describing how existing development might be enhanced and new development might be accommodated while still preserving the intrinsic qualities of the corridor." Reasonably accommodating residential development is a proper vision for the CHMP, *not* eliminating development. The CHMP presently does not contain creative methods for accommodating development on private land.

A way to receive community support for the CHMP would be to include positive programs that will help landowners use their land, while at the same time protecting intrinsic qualities within the corridor. For example, the CHMP should suggest ways of helping landowners do such things as reconfigure parcels so development may be better located, acquire easements from neighboring landowners (including from public landowners) so access roads may be moved to be less obtrusive, and other creative means of helping landowners use their land while avoiding need for acquisition.

a. Change pages 35-36 of the CMP to eliminate subjective statements biased against some features (such as residences) and in favor of others (the changes also correct bias against informal pullouts per point 7):

North Coast

The northern Big Sur Coast is more heavily traveled owing to its proximity to the communities on the Monterey Peninsula, themselves important travel destinations. ~~This portion of the coast presents the most dramatic changes in scenic quality.~~ Traveling south there is a progression from the urbanized areas near Carmel Valley to the agricultural scene at the Carmel River; beyond the river, views of Monastery beach and Pt. Lobos State Reserve are prominent before entering the busy residential community of the Carmel Highlands. South of Malpas Creek, residential development drops off and the dramatic coastal views open up, most prominently near Garrapata State Park.

Viewing opportunities are numerous along this portion of the highway. ~~Many~~ Some of the pullouts are paved and easily identified, such as at Hurricane Point and Little Sur River; others with dramatic views remain unpaved and are less obvious to the traveler, such as Granite Canyon and Garrapata Creek. Most of the view locations are intact with few detracting elements. While nearshore scenes unmistakably dominate the memorable views from the highway, individual intrinsic scenic features here include man-made elements such as the Carmelite Monastery, the cabin at Notley's Landing, and Bixby Creek Bridge.

~~The pressures of development are more evident along this portion of the coast. Overhead utility lines, residential development, road cuts and access roads to private property all detract from the overall visual quality. An unfortunate result of screening views of development from the highway in some cases also blocks more distant views of the landscape and the ocean. The major threat to the scenic quality along this portion of the highway is from continued residential development.~~

b. Change page 12 of the CMP to read:

- ***Guidelines for Corridor Aesthetics*** – Speaks to managing aspects of the highway and roadside environment in a manner that honors the unique scenic, natural and historic qualities of the corridor while protecting the long term viability of the Big Sur community and essential traveler safety.

c. Change page 19 of the CMP to read:

The USDA Forest Service and the California Department of Parks and Recreation... ~~Land acquisition, through easements or purchase, can be a component of highway repairs in these areas.~~

d. Change page 31 of the CMP to read:

Public Lands include the Los Padres National Forest ... These holdings provide important open space and recreational opportunities and areas for resource protection but also include some of the most intensely developed and impacted areas on the Big Sur coast.

The role of land use planning has largely been to ensure that development that does occur is harmonious with ~~what has come before~~ the area and that both resource protection and community preferences are reflected in policy. Most of the more recent residential development has occurred in portions of the corridor area closer to existing urban areas to the north. Since 1970's state and federal agencies and non-profit organizations have purchased large blocks of land throughout the corridor, while implementation of coastal policies have sharply limited the level of new development ~~in the viewshed~~. The Big Sur community has expressed concern about continued conversion of private land into public ownership. Approximately one-third of the private land within the Big Sur planning area was acquired by public and quasi-public entities between 1986 and 2003. The Big Sur community desires that corridor qualities be protected in ways that do not require further acquisition of private land. This may require new and innovative ways of accommodating future development. Means of protecting corridor intrinsic values while retaining land in private ownership might include sale of public land into private ownership, public / private land trades, assisting landowners with lot line adjustments, resubdivisions, and other parcel reconfigurations that help landowners relocate development, monetary and other forms of assistance to landowners to help them design and construct projects in ways that diminish impacts, and assisting landowners with obtaining access easements across neighboring land (including public land). Creativity and a cooperative working relationship with individual landowners and the community will be key to this vision's success.

e. Change page 32 of the CMP to read:

The resident population includes innkeepers, business proprietors, ranchers and their employees; government employees (and their families) with state parks, national forest and highway maintenance. Other residents, who may be less visible on a day-to-day basis include writers, artists and notable persons. In recent years, rising real estate prices in some locations have presented a kind of "means test" for those who have found inspiration in the rugged isolation of Big Sur (and to other would-be residents as well). In the early and mid-20th century, writers, artists and musicians could live in simple dwellings in the Big Sur area before achieving commercial success. In some areas of Big Sur that tradition continues, but in others rising prices make purchasing a home an expensive proposition ~~Today a new artist resident is more likely to have achieved a significant measure of economic success in the form of a best-selling book, gallery showings or a recording contract.~~

~~Growth and development in Monterey County and throughout the State and a disproportionate increase in an aging population (retirees), will undoubtedly affect the region with a rise in traffic levels. Given the various constraints and the community's protective spirit, however, it is hoped that the area's basic economy based in - tourism, recreation and ranching - is not expected to will not change appreciably. However, continued public and quasi-public acquisition of private land threatens the future well being of the area. For example, the opportunity for traditional cattle ranching has been reduced substantially as ranching land has been acquired by government agencies.~~

f. Change page 34 of the CMP to read:

The experience of traveling the corridor is felt primarily... ~~The analysis also characterizes features that detract from overall visual quality.~~

g. Change pages 35-36 of the CMP to read:

~~The pressures of development are more evident along this portion of the coast. Overhead utility lines, residential development, road cuts and access roads to private property all detract from the overall visual quality. An unfortunate result of screening views of development from the highway in some cases also blocks more distant views of the landscape and the ocean. The major threat to the scenic quality along this portion of the highway is from continued residential development.~~

h. Change page 42 of the CMP. The stricken paragraph presents a bias against private land and misleads the reader. For example, the California Department of Parks and Recreation filled pullouts with dirt to prevent parking and fenced off numerous existing coastal access points along Garrapata State Park, preventing coastal access across much public parkland. Both public and private landowners are capable of blocking coastal access, and both are capable of providing it.

~~North of Lucia, where the boundary of the Los Padres Forest recedes from the coastline and the highway, private land ownership restricts access to areas off the highway. As the highway travels north, there are several large tracts of state lands, either Reserves or Parks, which provide shoreline access for active sports pursuits.~~

i. Change page 58 of the CMP to read:

- ~~Avoid and reduce interference with wildlife corridors~~

j. Change page 59 of the CMP to read:

- ~~Honor community concerns regarding acquisition of private property and rights for public purposes~~ desire that private property and interests therein not be acquired by public or quasi-public entities.

k. Change page 60 of the CMP to read:

There is recognition that the needs of one ... The community ~~strives~~ is striving ardently to end this buyout of private land so it may retain its strong sense of character and identity and ~~wishes to~~ remain a viable and sustainable community. Accommodating needs of visitors should not outweigh the desires and needs of the local community for whom the highway is a central feature of daily life, and vice versa. Protection of one resource should also not outweigh another, ~~unless special protections are warranted, such as the need to sustain endangered species.~~

l. Change page 62 of the CMP to read;

~~Stakeholders representing various interests have identified common threats to the overall experience.~~

m. Change page 76 of the CMP to read:

D-1.10 Develop a ~~"hit-list" of detractors and list of detractors such as unnecessary signs, invasive plants, earthen berms, metal guardrails, and similar~~ visual clutter for remediation by Caltrans over time to enhance the scenic qualities along the corridor and undertaken as part of regular funded programs and projects. (Caltrans, Short-term)

D-1.11 Evaluate opportunities for public-private cooperation to protect ~~the critical viewshed across developable vacant lots~~ highway views within the corridor by means that accommodate development and do not entail acquisition of private land by public or quasi-public entities. (Monterey County regional Parks Peninsula Regional Park District and Coast Property Owners Association, on-going)

n. Change page 76 (Strategic Management Area B table) of the CMP to read (note, page numbers for the table are out of sequence with the rest of the CMP):

B-3.2 Limit number of unnecessary ~~private roads and recreational access road~~ entrances.

o. Change page F-4 through F-10 of Appendix G in the CMP to delete all references to funding for acquisition of land and interests in land:

[Under the Federal Lands Highway Program] "~~scenic easements and scenic or historic sites (includes acquisition);~~"

[Under the Forest Legacy Program] "~~Projects to acquire property for permanent forest protection~~"

[Under the Habitat Conservation Fund Grant Program] "~~Projects to conserve habitats that are wetlands, riparian, or near recreational trails.~~"

[Under the Land Acquisition Program] "~~Acquisition of real property or rights of real property in conjunction with the Department of Fish and Game for the purpose of wildlife conservation~~"

[Under the National Recreational Trails Grant Program] "~~acquire trail easements; purchase property; construct new trails on state, county, municipal or private land~~"

[Under the National Heritage Preservation Tax Credit Program] "~~Provision of tax-credits to private landowners who agree to donate land or water rights to state and local agencies or designated non-profit organizations for conservation purposes~~"

[Under the Recreational Trails Program] "~~acquire property right for trails~~"

[Under the Sport Fish Restoration Grants Payments to States Program] "~~including acquisition and development of facilities for public use of sport fish resources.~~"

p. Change page 1 of the GCA to read:

The guidelines are also produced in the spirit of ~~promoting~~ expressing solutions that are sensitive to their overall context of social, historic, scenic and environmental values. For Highway 1, the objective is to honor the corridor's unique qualities while

protecting ~~and promoting~~ traveler safety and providing for essential transportation needs. Among the corridor's unique qualities are the communities through which the corridor passes.

q. Change page 3 of the GCA to read:

In 1965, Highway 1 in Monterey County along the ... ~~These designations invoke special consideration for actions to protect the corridor's unique qualities.~~

r. Change page 4 of the GCA to read:

Preserving the scenic and natural qualities of the environment through which Highway 1 passes has been a consistent theme of local, county and state planning for well over 50 years. More recently, focus has also been on protecting the long-term viability of the communities through which the highway passes. The Big Sur CHMP and its supporting guidelines respond to ~~and build upon~~ these efforts and the resulting planning policies. The most broadly applicable documents are the California Coastal Act of 1976 and the Big Sur Coast Land Use Plan of the Monterey County Local Coastal Program, 1986.

s. Change page 12 of the GCA to read:

3. ~~Protect and restore~~ native habitats and corridor natural, scenic and cultural resources, including communities though which the corridor passes.

t. Change page 42 of the GCA to read:

Wherever possible, fencing should not create barriers to wildlife crossing the Highway 1 ~~corridor~~ right-of-way.

3. Accurately state highway capacity, LOS, and use information. The CHMP must accurately state Highway 1 capacity, LOS, and use information. It should also state that given that peak use of the highway is presently near or over capacity and desirable LOS, additional peak-period visitation should not be encouraged.

a. Change page 28 of the CMP. Change [bracketed] language to conform with actual statistics.

Interestingly, over the past 20 years the rate of traffic growth in the Big Sur area of Highway 1 has been only half the statewide average for this type of road. Growth here has also exhibited only half the rate experienced along Route 101, the closest parallel route on the state highway system. Nevertheless, during peak use periods, use of the highway presently exceeds what may be accommodated at ideal levels of service. In some portions of the corridor, peak use is presently at or near capacity. The current peak hour capacity of Highway 1 through Big Sur in rolling terrain, such as through the El Sur Ranch, is 1090 vehicles per hour. Current peak hour volumes are in the 620-740 range and are projected to remain below capacity through the year 2025 planning horizon in such areas. In mountainous terrain, such as in the Hurricane Point area, capacity is [800] vehicles per hour. In these areas, peak use presently [exceeds] capacity. In other areas of the corridor present peak use exceeds ideal levels of service.

Level of service (LOS) measures how the route operates during peak hour traffic. Level of service summarizes the effects of speed, travel time, traffic interruptions, freedom to maneuver and other factors. On a two-lane highway such as Route 1, the primary measures of service quality (LOS) are percent time-spent-following and average travel speed. The central section of the highway corridor (between Castro Canyon and Andrew Molera State Park) currently operates at LOS D (unstable flow where passing becomes extremely difficult). Areas in mountainous terrain such as the Hurricane Point area currently operate at LOS E (passing becomes virtually impossible, percent of time following slower traffic is greater than 85%).

Capacity is measured at the highest number of vehicles that can travel a road at LOS E. Ordinarily, LOS C is the target level of service for a two-lane rural highway. LOS C for Highway 1 through Big Sur in rolling and mountainous terrain is presently about 630 and 210 vehicles per hour respectively. Typically, measures to reach this level increase the number of vehicles that may be accommodated at LOS C might include additional capacity (travel lanes), turn lanes and/or passing lanes. However, as stipulated by the California Coastal Act, Highway 1 along the rural Big Sur Coast is to remain a two-lane facility. Policies that discourage expansion of the roadway are based upon an appreciation for the scenic and recreational qualities of the route and a belief that the highway should be subordinate to the wild and natural character of the land. Moreover, on some stretches of the highway the enormity of cuts and fills required to widen the road are simply not practical. It is thought that a widened highway would diminish the sense of escape from urban patterns so strongly associated with the coast highway. Given present high peak use levels and constraints on improving capacity, additional peak period visitation to the area should not be encouraged.

b. Change page 28 of the CMP to correct factual error:

The transportation concept for the Big Sur Coast Highway provides for ... Turnouts and left-turn lanes are ~~not~~ an uncommon sight in the corridor.

4. Avoid capacity-reducing conflict between non-motorized and motorized highway use. The CHMP must state that any facility that will accommodate bicycle use will be designed so use by bicyclists will not reduce the motor-vehicle carrying capacity of the highway.

a. Change page 29-30 of the CMP to read (also corrects misleading language):

Highway 1 along the Big Sur Coast is also part of the Pacific Coast Bike Route and sees hardy cyclists regularly. For the most part, bicycle trips are recreational in nature and do not serve as functional substitutes for motorized travel (i.e. commuting). ~~The highway is a Class III bicycle route meaning that cyclists~~ Cyclists generally share the road with vehicles and do not have designated bike lanes. Cyclists generally must ride as far to the right of the road as is safe; ~~under some circumstances, such as where a sufficient shoulder does not exist, cyclists are permitted to share the lane.~~

While consistent paved shoulders would improve some conditions for motorized and non-motorized travelers alike, such an improvement ~~is unlikely to change~~ may increase the transportation demand by pedestrians ~~or~~ and cyclists, potentially lowering motor-vehicle carrying capacity or LOS of the highway due to friction between users. Therefore, before Caltrans makes changes to the highway that might result in such lowered capacity or LOS, a study will be conducted to determine the ultimate effect. If study reveals the result would be lowered capacity or LOS, the project will be modified to avoid such impact. Non-motorized use of the corridor should also avoid interference with use of pullouts and turnouts by motorized users.

b. Change page 72 of the CMP to read:

The intent of these strategies is ... (4) to enhance the potential for non-motorized touring without reducing the highway's safety, motor-vehicle carrying capacity, or LOS.

c. Change page 73 of the CMP to read:

C-2.4 Incorporate consistent 4-foot paved shoulders, as appropriate and feasible, as part of funded capital projects if the study in C-2.7 determines that construction and use would not reduce Highway 1 capacity or LOS. ...

C-2.5 Provide unobtrusive reminders about shared-use of the highway. ...

C-2.7 Conduct a study to determine if consistent four foot paved shoulders would increase use by non-motorized users such that motor vehicle carrying capacity or LOS would be reduced due to friction. (Caltrans, short term) [Renummer following items]

d. Change page 19 of the GCA to read:

The importance of paved shoulders as ... Paved shoulders are included as part of specific highway reconstruction efforts (such as a repair necessitated by land sliding), at specific sites where needed for safety considerations, and ~~need to~~ may be part of a future integrated strategy to enhance conditions for the non-motorized traveler if study reveals that such use would not reduce motor-vehicle carrying capacity or LOS of the highway.

e. Change page 20 of the GCA to read:

2. ~~Where conditions reasonably permit~~ Conduct a study to determine the extent to which a consistent 4 foot paved shoulder would increase or decrease motor-vehicle carrying capacity or LOS of the highway. Among the factors to be considered shall be whether a consistent 4 foot paved shoulder would result in increased non-motorized use, and if so, whether such increased use would reduce motor-vehicle capacity or LOS of the highway due to friction between non-motorized use and use by motor vehicles. If the study reveals no diminishment in motor-vehicle LOS or capacity would result, where conditions reasonably permit, provide a paved shoulder to enhance improve conditions for non-motorized travelers. ~~This provides a measure of comfort for shared use of the highway.~~

f. Change page 55 of the GCA to read:

2. The geometric design of Highway 1 should safely accommodate pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists as shared users of the highway. Wherever possible study reveals that motor-vehicle capacity would not be reduced due to friction with non-motorized use, the highway should include consistent paved shoulders (see Section 3.2 Travel Lanes and Shoulders).

5. Conform corridor width to community request and federal regulations. The CHMP must state that the width of the corridor for aesthetic purposes is 400 feet (preferably less). This corridor width was overwhelmingly requested in public comment on the draft CHMP. Aside from providing a knowable boundary for the scenic corridor, this would also conform the CHMP with the definition for "corridor" in regulations for corridor management plans for scenic byways as published in the Federal Register ("*Corridor* means the road or highway right-of-way and the adjacent area that is visible from and extending along the highway", underline added, Federal Register, Vol. 60, No. 96, May 18, 1995, page 26759). Synonyms for "adjacent" are neighboring, contiguous, nearby, adjoining, bordering, next, closest, flanking, side, close, (antonym = distant). It is especially important that the CHMP define the width of the aesthetic corridor because the CHMP does not contain a map identifying the corridor boundaries as required by federal regulations ("The corridor management plan must include at least the following: (1) A map identifying the corridor boundaries ...", underline added, *Ibid* at page 26761). The CHMP has a map that does *not* define the corridor boundaries.

a. Change page 4 of the CMP. In addition to stating the 400 foot aesthetic corridor width, the change below deletes reference to Monterey County's critical viewshed policy, including a footnote that misstates the critical viewshed policy. The County's "critical viewshed" includes land that is neither adjacent to nor visible from Highway 1 and is therefore not suitable for use as a substitute for an identified aesthetic / scenic corridor in the CHMP.

~~For purposes of CHMP, the definition of the corridor is intentionally broad and somewhat qualitative. The definition width of the corridor varies based upon the particular resources that contribute to the sense of place or that could be affected based upon future actions. The narrowest conception of the corridor is the state highway right-of-way, which is generally 80-feet wide. Areas of different widths were evaluated for the purposes of identifying resources generally located along the highway that either influence or could be influenced by the presence of the highway.~~

Thus, for describing natural habitats through which the highway travels, a 400-foot wide corridor is evaluated. For understanding the geological context, landslides are characterized at a one-mile width. An important experience of traveling the route is, of course, the scenery ~~and what is seen from the highway; this visual envelope is commonly referred to as the viewshed~~⁴. For scenic / aesthetic purposes, the width of the corridor is 400 feet.

⁴ ~~Within Monterey County the term "critical viewshed" is used to describe and regulate development within the entire area that can be seen from Highway 1 and major public viewing areas.~~

b. Change page 34 of the CMP to read:

Viewsheds, for purposes of the CHMP, denote the visual "envelope" adjacent to and visible from Highway 1 that a person can see from a specific point and are generally quite large, encompass many different visual elements and landscapes, and are often defined by topographic features.

6. Any Byways organization must be comprised of a majority of residents and must encourage public participation. The CHMP must state that the majority of any Byways organization will be comprised of residents from within the areas through which the All American Road passes. Such composition conforms with the public will expressed during comment on the CHMP and with regulations for corridor management plans, "The corridor management plan must include at least the following: ... (6) A plan to assure on-going public participation in the implementation of the corridor management objectives" (Federal Register, Vol. 60, No. 96, May 18, 1995, page 26761). Other public participation changes below will also help the CHMP conform with corridor-plan regulations.

a. Change page 64 of the CMP to read:

The purview of the Implementation Working Group did not correspond with any of the strategic management areas presented in the Action Plan below. Implementation will entail its own structure, timing and funding. Oversight responsibilities for implementation are expected to be coordinated through a formalized collaboration of stakeholders, as an evolution of the CHMP Steering Committee. Implementation is addressed in detail in Chapter 6.

b. Change page 79 of the CMP to read:

In deliberations to date concerning its successor ... Elements of a proposed charter were drafted; the Steering Committee agreed to receive input on the proposal during circulation of the draft CHMP document(s) for public review and comment. Based upon public comment received, the proposed charter was removed from this plan. Public comments expressed a strong desire that the majority of the membership of any Byways organization be residents of the areas through which the All American Road passes, with representation proportional from along its length. Although the plan no longer contains a suggested charter, it is intended that membership of the Byways organization will be comprised of a majority of residents of areas through which the All American Road passes.

c. Change page 80 of the CMP to read:

Caltrans may serve as interim Implementation Manager following adoption of the CHMP until the role of manager or coordinator is more fully specified by the Coordinating Corridor Council.

As its development, implementation of the CHMP must continue as an open public process. Federal regulations for corridor plans require that implementation of the CHMP be conducted in a manner that encourages active public participation. One of the first undertakings of the new Byways organization will be to establish a process by which the public will have meaningful opportunities for participating in implementation decisions, and a process by which the public may replace resident members of the organization by petition or similar means to encourage representation

that reflects the public will.

d. Change page 81 of the CMP to read:

1. A charter for the Highway 1 Corridor Council for the Big Sur Coast, or other successor to the Steering Committee will be written with opportunities for meaningful public input and accepted by member organizations. The draft charter shall be distributed to the public and presented before the Big Sur Multi-Agency Advisory Council for public review before it is put into effect. (See proposed charter, above.) The charter shall specify the membership of the Corridor Council, which shall include a majority of members who are residents of areas through which the highway passes.

2. Once established, the The Corridor Council will identify its preferences for membership, participation and leadership on the Implementation Management Team if such a team is included in the charter, including appointment of a Fiscal Agent. (Caltrans may serve as interim Implementation Manager until this step has been completed) provided however, if Caltrans assumes such role, any interim implementation actions proposed prior to formation of the Corridor Council shall first be presented by Caltrans to the Big Sur Multi-Agency Advisory Council for public review.

e. Change page 82 of the CMP to read:

The annual review of progress and modifications to the CHMP will accommodate a limited scope of change within the framework of these documents and current institutional arrangements. The CHMP should be formally reviewed, evaluated and updated periodically to reflect fundamental changes in the context of planning for the corridor and to reaffirm commitment to the effort. While details of the update will properly be decided by the Corridor Council and the Implementation Manager with public input, a three-year interval for such an update is recommended with the first to be completed in the spring of 2007.

Appendix F provides a list of potential funding opportunities that could be accessed for projects along the Coast Highway Corridor. Such projects range from actions identified in the CHMP to needs that may be identified in the future. Interested parties should contact administering agency or organization for more specific eligibility criteria and application requirements, and prior to application should seek public input through the process established by the Corridor Council, or if such process has not been established, by presenting their proposal for public input before the Big Sur Multi-Agency Advisory Council.

f. Change Appendix F, page D-3 of the CMP to read:

APPENDIX F Byway Organization and Background

In keeping with the grass roots spirit of the Byways movement as well as the strong desire of the public as expressed in comments on the draft CHMP, and in order to conform with regulations that require corridor plans to "assure on-going public participation in the implementation of corridor management objectives", any Byways organization or council formed will be comprised of a majority of residents of the

areas through which the All American Road passes.

7. Retain the present informal visitor experience. The CHMP must say that the present informal visitor experience will not be formalized, that there should be no new visitor information centers, that informal pullouts will be the preferred method for stopping to discover views and more viewpoints will not be added, and that any interpretative programs will be designed so only those who desire to participate need know of their existence (e.g., radio, cassettes, or brochures rather than kiosks or displays).

a. Change page 35 of the CMP to remove bias against informal opportunities (changes related to point 2 are also included):

Viewing opportunities are numerous along this portion of the highway. ~~Many~~ Some of the pullouts are paved ~~and easily identified~~, such as at Hurricane Point and Little Sur River; others with dramatic views remain unpaved ~~and are less obvious to the traveler~~, such as Granite Canyon and Garrapata Creek. Most of the view locations are intact with few detracting elements. While nearshore scenes unmistakably dominate the memorable views from the highway, individual intrinsic scenic features here include man-made elements ~~such as the Carmelite Monastery, the cabin at Notley's Landing, and Bixby Creek Bridge.~~

b. Change page 41 of the CMP to read:

Educational and contemplative opportunities are abundant ... At present there are no visitor centers or interpretive centers in or along the highway right-of-way, and public comment on the draft CHMP indicates that none are wanted.

c. Change page 60 of the CMP to read:

- ~~Protect and enhance~~ informal opportunities for public viewing ~~with carefully planned and managed vista points, turnouts and pullouts~~ by retaining existing pullouts.

- ~~Provide~~ Continue providing abundant ~~opportunities for short-term parking pullouts~~ where vehicles can safely pull off the highway and park clear of the travel lane and shoulder.

d. Change page 61 of the CMP to read:

Roadside parking is a matter of concern to ~~many~~ some stakeholders. Parking is generally not prohibited except where it is determined to be unsafe. ...

e. Change page 62 of the CMP to read (also contains changes re point 2):

The Action Plan supports the vision for the Big Sur Coast Highway. The primary benefits of the Action Plan are the following: (1) maintaining the road in a safe operating condition, (2) ~~enhancing~~ retaining the present informal traveler experience, (3) protecting corridor resources while reasonably accommodating development, and (4) providing for a balanced, coordinated, action-oriented approach to achieving the corridor vision. Each of these benefits is described below.

Benefit 2: ~~Supporting & Enhancing~~ Retaining the Informal Travel Experience

This stretch of highway is a national treasure. ~~The state and national designations recognize that the corridor's natural scenery and rural setting should be preserved and enhanced for the enjoyment and pleasure for generations to come. It is one of the few places of its kind left where visitors are not overly managed, but are instead left with a feeling that they have explored and discovered on their own. It is critical to the success of the vision for the corridor that the informality of the visitor experience be retained.~~

Stakeholders representing various interests have identified ~~common threats to ways to maintain~~ the overall informal experience while accommodating travelers needs. This Action Plan includes strategies and actions that address the essential components of corridor enjoyment:

f. Change page 72 of the CMP to read:

~~C-1.2— Evaluate opportunities to enhance availability of visitor information at both ends of the corridor, Carmel River in the north and San Simeon in the south. (CA Dept of Parks & Recreation, Long-term)~~

g. Change page 74 of the CMP to read:

Interpretive information is currently available within units of the State Parks and some private facilities as well as in books, pamphlets and audiotapes available for purchase and at libraries and over the Internet. The intent of this strategy is to ~~approach this comprehensively as is necessary~~ discourage invasive interpretation and to honor the overriding value of the Big Sur experience as discovery and revelation, rather than guided tour.

C-4.1 Consider development of a corridor-wide interpretive program that addresses needs of Caltrans, Los Padres National Forest, the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary, California Coastal National Monument and State Parks and that highlights corridor themes and qualities along its length, while directing people away from sensitive areas and private property. Any such program should conform with C-4.2 and C-4.3 so as not to intrude on the experience of those who do not choose to participate. (USFS, Short-term)

h. Change page 76 (Strategic Management Area B table) of the CMP to read (note, page numbers for the table are out of sequence with the rest of the CMP):

B-3.3 ~~Require~~ Consider, with public input, new facilities and expansion of existing facilities for safe off-highway parking.

i. Change page 13 of the GCA to read:

2. Promote Support a network of motorized and non-motorized public access that

balances recreational opportunities and the protection of sensitive resources, private properties, and community values, while retaining the existing informal visitor experience

j. Change page 21 of the GCA to read:

Public comment on the draft CHMP revealed that additional vista points are not desired on the Big Sur section of Highway 1. A vista point is a formally designated (and signed) paved area beyond the highway shoulder that provides a formal visitor-serving amenity along the highway. Vista points are typically signed with two blue retroreflective signs, one telling the traveler that the vista point is 1/4 mile down the road, and one telling the traveler that they have reached the vista point. Similar function is provided by pullouts, which are not formalized or signed (see description below). Vista points and pullouts both allow travelers a place to pull safely off the road and stop to take in a characteristic view of the landscape. The vista point designation denotes a level of permanence (or at least longevity) along the route affording it regular maintenance corresponding to the level of use. Vista points provide for short-term parking and may include other amenities such as walkways, interpretive displays, drinking water and restrooms.

k. Change page 24 of the GCA to read:

2. Any changes or modifications to existing pullouts should be driven by safety or operational needs; options for permanence should be evaluated (e.g. such as designating vista points). Modifications to existing pullouts or establishment of any new pullouts must consider the compatibility with adjacent land uses and intensity of existing use. Maintain a smooth transition between the roadway and the surface of unpaved pullouts by backing to pavement level as required.

l. Change page 25 of the GCA to read:

New highway construction here will generally be limited to that which responds to fundamental highway safety and operations, landslide management, storm damage, major maintenance and rehabilitation¹⁸. New construction could also include new visitor amenities such as vista points (See Section 3.2, Roadway Elements, above). The purpose of these guidelines is to ensure that new construction, where it occurs, is in keeping with the unique character and setting of the corridor.

m. Change page 33 of the GCA to read:

Generally, mitigation to reduce the visibility ... The value and use of the features and systems may also be highlighted as an item of interest (see Section 3.6 Roadside Interpretation and Traveler Amenities).

n. Change page 45 of the GCA to read:

2. Toward reducing overall clutter in the corridor, existing signage within the Highway 1 right-of-way should be evaluated as part of a regular comprehensive review to identify signs that are necessary for essential safe highway operation and orderly movement of traffic. Those signs not deemed necessary for that purpose should be so identified and listed for removal subject to consensus of the affected

stakeholders. Viewpoint signs should be among the first considered for removal.

o. Change pages 49-50 of the GCA to read:

Lighting, overhead utility lines and other communication facilities are part of the basic infrastructure that supports human occupation and travel through the corridor. Although such features are mostly utilitarian in nature, in many locations they contribute significantly to the overall visual context of the corridor. ~~Features such as roadside interpretation and other traveler~~ Traveler amenities and alternative transportation facilities function primarily to support the enjoyment and convenience of the visitor or non-resident traveler. ...

p. Change pages 53-55 of the GCA to read:

Roadside Interpretation & Roadside Traveler Amenities [Underline in original not shown.]

The following guidelines address, in general terms, the provision of ~~interpretive features and other~~ traveler amenities along Highway 1. Public comment on the draft CHMP indicates that on-site interpretation is not desired within the corridor. If interpretation is provided, off-site means should be used such as radio, brochures, cassette tape or CD audio recordings, or other means of assisting a self-guided tour without impacting those not participating. A more comprehensive program for the corridor would be needed to specify greater detail about whether or how to propose ~~on-site~~ off-site interpretation and who would be responsible for different interpretive programs. ~~Consensus has not yet been achieved regarding on-site interpretation. Likewise, no~~ No decisions have been made about providing roadside amenities for the benefit of the visitor. The following basic suggestions can help guide further discussion.

Interpretation [Underline in original.]

1. ~~The concept of interpretation should be broadly defined and not limited to traditional physical elements such as signage and on-site displays.~~ In keeping with the unfolding nature of exploring the Big Sur Coast, interpretation should be grounded in the dynamic mode of *discovery and revelation* rather than in the static mode of *explanation*. ~~In support of the rugged scenic values of the coast, on-site interpretative features should be minimal in number and physically unobtrusive.~~

2. Interpretation should be provided according to a corridor-wide program developed with consensus among stakeholders that identifies themes, techniques, methods and media for communicating the information. Alternatives to on-site features and displays (such as recorded audio information for individual use) will be ~~encouraged~~ used to promote the experience of self-guided discovery.

3. ~~If on-site interpretation is determined desirable, a visual display at an appropriate site (such as a vista point) is recommended. In addition to overall visual compatibility with character, the design should be low profile and materials should be selected for durability, resistance to vandalism and low maintenance. The display should be an incidental rather than prominent feature. No display should interfere with a view or compromise the authentic experience of discovering the rugged Big Sur Coast. Interpretation should honor the value of an unscripted experience in lieu of a classroom or guided experience.~~

4. The following preliminary set of themes for interpretation ~~should~~ may be considered in developing a corridor-wide program:

5. Ensure proper partnership commitments (lead agency, personnel and funding) are in place for effective development, design, ~~construction, maintenance, repair~~ and updating of content, as needed.

Other Amenities [Underline in original.]

1. Consider restoration of the rock masonry features at the historic roadside drinking fountains. Based on the potential for providing safe access, and with public input, determine whether providing any other amenities (~~such as interpretation~~) would be appropriate for these sites.

~~3. In considering sites for additional amenities, look at upgrading existing vista points or establishing one to two additional vista points along the Big Sur Coast³³. In addition to parking, amenities might include picnic areas, restrooms and interpretation. A carefully developed process will be founded on effective stakeholder and public participation and formation of partnerships with key stakeholders; thorough collaboration would be used to will develop criteria for site locations, amenities, size, design, construction and maintenance of the facilities~~ any amenities.

q. Change pages 53-54 of the GCA to read:

8. Bicycle path within the highway right-of-way. The CHMP must provide that any bicycle path that is developed will be within the Highway 1 right-of-way, except where it passes through existing public lands. Proposition 70 lands must not be developed for a bike path or similar use.

a. Change page 55 of the GCA to read:

1. Ideally, pedestrians and bicyclists would be physically separated from the highway with a dedicated pathway. Although this objective may not be attainable throughout the corridor, opportunities should be explored for segments of high use. Even discontinuous segments of separated paths would be desirable if properly planned, designed and executed. Separation of paths from the highway outside the Highway 1 right-of-way should be limited to areas where the highway passes through lands in existing public ownership. Land on which funds were expended from Proposition 70, the California Wildlife, Coastal, and Park Land Conservation Act, may not be used to accommodate such paths, as California Public Resources Code section 5928(b) precludes such use.

3. While the preferred alignment for the California Coastal Trail would generally be separated from the highway, some sections will rely on the highway on an interim basis and on a long-term or permanent basis where no other options are available. Relationship to the future alignment of the trail should be considered in the planning

and design of any highway improvement. Accommodation of the alignment might include an adequate shoulder or separated path, provision of an adequate bench (notch) on a fill slope, or the design of a cantilevered walk or pedestrian bridge across a canyon. Provisions for pedestrian safety must be made; in some situations, natural or man-made protective barriers may be required. Refer to Section 3.4 for guidance on the design of such features. Separation of the California Coastal Trail from the highway outside the Highway 1 right-of-way should be limited to areas where the highway passes through lands in existing public ownership. Land on which funds were expended from Proposition 70, the California Wildlife, Coastal, and Park Land Conservation Act, may not be used for such use, as California Public Resources Code section 5928(b) precludes it.

9. The critical viewshed policy applies to Caltrans. The CHMP must acknowledge that Monterey County's critical viewshed policy applies to CalTrans developments that are not expressly excepted.

a. Change page 5 of the GCA to read:

~~Since Highway 1 provides the very foundation that defines the critical viewshed, the~~
~~The LUP affords reasonable~~ provides specific exceptions to this its critical viewshed
~~policy for some types of development associated with the highway facilities.~~ Scenic
resource protection policies of the LUP, ~~in acknowledging this exception provide~~
guidance for design of those highway features that are exempted from the critical
viewshed policy, as follows:

b. Change page 51 of the GCA to read:

As communication technology develops, so do ... In Monterey County, the critical viewshed policy of the Big Sur LUP would apply ~~where a feature was not clearly highway dependent; for example, due to its very nature, an emergency callbox might be considered a highway feature~~ to highway development that is visible and not expressly exempted from the policy.

2. Innovative techniques and methods for camouflaging new installations are encouraged.³² ~~Where a feature is not dependent on being within the right-of-way (i.e. could not be interpreted as a highway feature), critical~~ Critical viewshed policies of the Monterey County LCP may prevent a visible installation.