



TOLAY LAKE REGIONAL PARK MASTER PLAN SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY WORKSHOP #2



100 Adobe Canyon Road
Kenwood, CA 95452

February 2014

I. Introduction

The Sonoma County Regional Parks Department is currently preparing a long-term Master Plan for Tolay Lake Regional Park. The two properties comprising Tolay Lake Regional Park are relatively recent acquisitions, and the park is currently open to limited public access through the Day-Use Permit Program, as outlined in the 2008 Interim Plan. The Master Plan will address the creation of permanent improvements and increased public access.

The Tolay Lake Regional Park master planning process, which will take approximately two years, is divided into three major phases. During Phase 1, “Discovery,” which took place between January and June 2013, the Tolay Lake Regional Park Master Plan project team conducted a variety of public engagement activities designed to solicit stakeholder and community input regarding desired future activities in the park. During Phase 2, “Plan Development,” the project team is developing the Master Plan based on this input, as well as evaluations made on the basis of consistency with existing Regional Parks policies; impacts on health and safety; impacts to neighbors; costs to build, operate, and maintain; and consistency with federal, state and local environmental laws. The first step in Phase 2 was to develop conceptual plan alternatives for park development. The purpose of Community Workshop #2 was to get stakeholder and public feedback on the conceptual plan alternatives. This feedback will be factored into development of the draft Master Plan. Community Workshop #2 took place on January 16, 2014, at the Petaluma Community Center.

II. Outreach

The workshop was promoted and advertised through a variety of methods, including:

- E-mail announcement to Regional Park Members, Tolay Lake Regional Park Day Use Permit Holders, and E-News subscribers
- Posting on the Sonoma County Regional Parks website, and Regional Parks Facebook page
- Advertisement in La Voz, a bilingual English-Spanish newspaper serving Sonoma and neighboring North Bay counties
- Press release to local media

III. Workshop Format

The workshop was conducted by Sonoma County Regional Park Department (SCRPD) staff with assistance from the Sonoma County Agricultural Preservation and Open Space District (SCAPOS), Master Plan consultants MIG, Inc., and Master Plan project partners. Each participant received an agenda backed with information on how the public can continue to be involved in the Master Plan process; handouts on the park Vision, conceptual plan alternatives and interpretive concepts; and a comment form.

The evening began with a half-hour Open House, during which participants were encouraged to view displays depicting existing conditions at the park and detailing conceptual plan options. Three alternatives were detailed, with Alternative Option A having the smallest development footprint and Alternative Options B and C having successively larger footprints. Potential interpretive concepts and “story zones” giving information about different aspects of the park’s natural, cultural and agricultural history were also listed, with a map displaying where these zones might be located. The following displays were included:

- Site Alternatives Framework, including:
 - Vision for Tolay Lake Regional Park
 - Highlights for Tolay Plan Alternatives
 - Potential Interpretive Concepts and Story Zones
- Plan Alternatives Table showing Planning Issues as addressed in Alternatives A, B and C
- Existing Conditions Maps:
 - Overall Project Area
 - Northern Park Core Area
- Conceptual Plan Maps:
 - Interpretive Plan with Proposed Interpretive Elements for Overall Project Area
 - Conceptual Site Plan Maps for Overall Project Area: Option A, B and C
 - Conceptual Site Plan Maps for Northern Park Core Area: Option A, B and C

The workshop portion of the evening was opened by Caryl Hart, Director of SCRP, who welcomed participants and introduced team members. Next, John Baas of MIG gave a PowerPoint presentation which provided an overview of progress on the Master Plan process to date and information regarding next steps.

At the conclusion of the overview presentation, Carolyn Verheyen of MIG explained the format of the “walking workshop” that followed. This consisted of two different stations where participants could view maps showing conceptual plan alternatives for the park, ask questions and contribute their feedback. (Three stations had originally been planned, but the number was reduced in order to allow more time for participants at each station.) The two stations were as follows:

- Station 1: Alternatives for Planning Issues; Conceptual Plan Options for Overall Project Area; Proposed Interpretive Elements
- Station 2: Conceptual Plan Options for Northern Park Core Area; Proposed Interpretive Elements

Workshop attendees were split into two groups of approximately equal size and given approximately 25 minutes to participate in discussion at each station. A bell was rung to mark the end of each session, at which time the groups switched places. During each session,

facilitators and project staff answered participants' questions and recorded their feedback on flipchart paper.

At the conclusion of the "walking workshop" discussions, the larger group reconvened for a final question-and-answer and comment period, facilitated by Ms. Verheyen. She reminded participants of the next steps in the process and additional participation opportunities including visiting the project website for further information. Participants were asked to submit comments prior to February 10th, when the next phase of planning begins, including an additional workshop and other opportunities to participate.

Participants were also encouraged to provide additional written comments via comment form. Since several participants had individual discussions with team members that were not recorded, Ms. Verheyen also urged participants to make sure they included any comments from these discussions on their comment forms. Ms. Verheyen clarified that participants need not support all elements of any given Alternative as a whole, but that they were free to "mix and match," or to make other suggestions. To this end, she also suggested that participants could mark their copy of the Alternatives Table handout to show which option they preferred for each planning issue.

IV. Workshop Participation and Results

Participation

Over 40 stakeholders and members of the public attended the workshop. The majority were Sonoma County residents. A variety of stakeholder groups were represented, including residents, local land owners, the Federated Indians of Graton Rancheria (FIGR), various public agencies, and representatives of specific user groups.

Results

Participants' questions and comments, both those spoken during the workshop and written comments submitted via comment form or another method provided, are summarized below.

General Comments

During the workshop and on their comment forms, participants commented on a wide variety of aspects of the conceptual plan alternatives and the plan process.

Intensity of Park Development and Impacts

A number of participants expressed reservations regarding the intensity of proposed development in the park, particularly of Alternative Option C with its fairly large footprint, and possible impacts on the park's serene, wild nature. Several noted that increased, unpermitted use will require greatly increased maintenance and management to ensure fee collection and rule enforcement, as well as calling for user responsibility. They referred to examples of other parks in the region where the property and features such as trails have degraded quickly due to popularity and inconsiderate use. Although many participants hope to see expanded features

and opportunities for activities at the park, there was some concern expressed that since the park is isolated and not easy to get to, development at the level of Option C would outstrip demand. Representatives of the FIGR also requested that certain vulnerable or sacred areas be protected from the impacts of greater park usage.

Participants noted concerns as well with the idea of overnight stays – whether camping or in buildings – and the associated impacts. It was suggested that such uses at least be concentrated in one part of the site, leaving large areas of the park open to landscape and wildlife. Some concern was also expressed that the cost of overnight stays in buildings would be exclusionary – campsites might be more inclusive and less disruptive.

Many participants were interested in seeing a mix of the options presented. It was noted that the master plan could be scalable; it's easier to plan for maximum use but not necessarily carry out all provisions of the plan, or to develop the park in phases.

Accessibility

Participants expressed concerns about accessibility to and within the park, both in general and as regards access to roads and trails. They commented that the main access road, Cannon Lane, needs grading or paving and improved drainage, and that this should be addressed no matter what level of development is chosen for the rest of the park. It was also noted that the adobe soil makes trails hard to maintain, with cracked, uneven surfaces for which it is difficult to compensate.

Other Development Issues

Other issues addressed included the location of parking, which some participants commented should remain where it currently is, or near the building at the top of the Cannon Lane entrance Road. Some comments addressed the renovation of buildings. It was noted that, while some of the buildings certainly need renovation in order to enhance their usage – the uneven floor surface in the Old Stone Barn was called out as an example – it's important to preserve their historic character. Participants made suggestions regarding funding of renovations or new buildings, including using donated funds to avoid an increase in County park taxes.

Trails, Hiking and Equestrian Uses

Many participants strongly support expanding trails throughout the park, with more trails, bigger loops and clear directional signage. Opinion on the level of trail development and the types of trails was divided, however. Some participants favor multi-use trails allowing bicycling and horse riding. Others were chiefly interested in using the trails for hiking and to enjoy the landscape, plants and wildlife. Some of those in the latter group expressed a desire to limit or even outright opposition to multi-use trails, maintaining that the trails are destroyed by bikes and horses, and that such uses should be limited to established roads.

A number of strong advocates of equestrian use among the attendees detailed specific accommodations that they would like to see at the park, including equestrian parking in an

open and level area, water troughs with an easily accessible water source, and equestrian trails of varying length with features such as picnic tables and hitch rails in natural settings.

Involvement

Regular users of Tolay Lake Regional Park were well represented among the attendees, and they showed strong enthusiasm and support for the enhancement of the park. Several participants commented on their appreciation of the opportunities provided for them to give input, and their approval of the process as well planned and inclusive.

Questions

Participants also asked a number of questions throughout the workshop, on subjects including the following:

- How the conceptual plan alternatives differ, and whether the different options can be combined or phased
- Levels of development
- Historic conditions and uses of the park
- Timing of transfer of property to the County by the Sonoma Land Trust, and when development might begin
- Impacts on and potential restoration of plants, wildlife and the landscape
- Nature of trails planned (number, mileage, seasonality) and rules regarding trails
- How camping and overnight stays will be administered, and concerns regarding affordability of these options
- Details of specific uses such as equestrian use
- Funding for park development and ongoing operations, and issues related to possible revenue-creating uses
- Requests for information including availability of conceptual maps and volunteer opportunities at the park

Support for Alternative Options

The comment form was set up to allow participants to indicate their level of support for the Alternative Options A, B and C for each of the three park areas, as well as to provide general or specific comments regarding park features or amenities they support or oppose. Nineteen comment forms were received, and two participants submitted a marked-up copy of the Alternatives Table to indicate their preferences for specific planning issues.

Northern Core Area

The majority of comment form respondents supported Alternative Options A and B for the Northern Core area. Response to Alternative Option C was more evenly divided, with a slight majority in opposition. A number of respondents expressed concern about the larger footprint of Option C, with its potential for damage to the natural environment and necessity for expanded oversight. Rather than adding features such as overnight accommodations in houses,

food service and additional buildings, they would rather see what is already there preserved, developed and upgraded, with an emphasis on the natural environment and interpretation of the agricultural, historic and cultural aspects of the site. Some of these respondents are in favor of overnight camping, but not a bunkhouse or stays in buildings. Other respondents were more supportive of intensive development, including the opportunities for revenue provided by overnight stays, food service and other amenities.

Respondents' opinions regarding alternatives for existing buildings on the site also varied. There was a fair amount of support for some degree of renovation to the buildings, at least those that are in better condition, for varying uses including overnight stays, interpretation, equestrian uses and an artist-in-residence program. Some supported the idea of renovating the Stone Floor Barn for use as a Visitor Center; an equal number opposed it, with one suggesting a new building closer to the parking area. A few respondents supported improvement of the existing "Miwok Village" as a cultural gathering area, as well as continuing to use some of the buildings for maintenance and storage.

Respondents also were in favor of more trails and trail improvements. Suggestions included ensuring that at least some trails are smooth, walkable and ADA-accessible. Trail connectivity, with provision of connecting loop trails, was also called out as important, and it was suggested that accessible trails should run from the buildings out to the lake area.

A number of respondents commented on the north park entrance drive. They were unanimously in favor of improving it, at least to the extent of improved grading and drainage, although not necessarily creating a paved, two-way road. Participants also provided comments in support of specific uses such as bird watching and equestrian use.

Central Park Area

Comment form respondents' levels of support or opposition for the Central Park area alternative options were more varied than those for the Northern Core. Response to Alternative Option A was evenly divided. Option B was supported by twice as many respondents as opposed it; response to Option C was the other way around.

Only a handful of respondents provided comments to explain their response. Those who commented on their opposition to Option C were again concerned about overly intensive development threatening wildlife and habitat preservation, as well as the experience of wilderness. There was some support for more trails in this area; one respondent commented that their support for Options B and C was based on ensuring that there are sufficient trails.

Southern Tip Area

Altogether respondents indicated a greater level of support than opposition for all three Southern Tip area options, although a number were strongly opposed. Some respondents repeated the concerns they had voiced regarding options for the Central Park area.

There was some support for more trails and hiking access in this area, with the suggestion made that the trail plan for Options B or C be added to Option A. Several respondents supported more campsites in this area, but others felt that camping and other development in this area should be minimal due to its environmental sensitivity.

Tolay Lake Regional Park Master Plan Workshop #2

January 16, 2014

Appendix A: Participant Comments

Station 1: Southern Tip and Central Park Area

- What is total # of miles of trails under each option?
- What is the timing of the transfer of the land deed from Sonoma Land Trust to SCRCP?
- Will the maps be made available online?
- What constitutes saturation of use?
- Tolay not easy to get to -- destination park
- Intensive uses historically: cattle more impactful than people
- What about resident owl if barn is renovated?
- Difficult to walk on floor in barn
- Not intensive uses in any options
 - Walk-in camping only
 - Equestrian uses
- Option "A" plus some trails from "B" would be good. Option "C" may be too much due to sensitive resources and water constraints.
- Isn't enough demand for option "C," don't see draw due to lack of trees, amenities
- Like extra trails in "C" with option "A" amenities
- Support "B" or "C" for hikers and equestrians
 - Need more trails and bigger loops
 - Need to spread out more
 - Signage is key
- Will trails be seasonal?
- What are key differences in the options?
- Can we phase in from "A" to "C" as more money becomes available?
- Why more ranger residences?
- What is impact on animals and plants?
- Like idea of more trails to enjoy plants and animals
- Is there a plan to restore all native plants?
- Change from pastoral landscape?
- With equestrian center, will there be boarding or day use?
- Are people allowed to go off trail?
- Are there volunteer opportunities?
- Residence for ranger in camping area?

Station 2: Northern Park Core

- Was the lake larger in historic times?
- How will overnight stays work?
- Where is the North Core?
- Is there a map showing all three options?
- When will the property be transferred to the County by the Land Trust?
- FIGR would like to know more specifically where the viewpoints will be located. Also, what exactly will be built or disturbed?
- Where does operations money come from? How will it be financed? Bonds?
- Can high-value options from “C” be added to “A?”
- When can development begin?
- Are we creating a two-tier system, where only affluent visitors have overnight stays?
- Rancheria wants some areas protected
- Concerns regarding ADA compensation on trails: Adobe spoils underlying trails, is uneven and difficult to negotiate. Little can be done about cracks.
- Access is important, especially around lakes
- Equestrian parking – needs to be one big open area (dairy barn)
- Will there be accessible water for water troughs at horse parking?
 - Like idea of equestrian parking on west ridge, not up and down hill
- Please improve access roads
- More bird watching trails
- Include Cannon Road to bottom of hill by ranger residence – bad spot. Pave – even consider in option “A.”
- Option “A” – does that include improving drainage on the access road?

Comment Forms

Level of Support and Associated Comments

PARK AREA: NORTHERN CORE				
1	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	I support business profit center models for development of income generating structures - go upscale and charge \$200/night rentals and do full service, including food for sale like Yosemite does
2	--	Strongly Support	--	--
3	Support	Support	Support	--
4	Strongly Support	Support	Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option C has too much human footprint, too much oversight by SCR. (ie overnight places to stay in bldgs.) • Ensure connecting loop trails • Ensure ADA trails from bldgs. Out near lake area • Option A has too few trails
5	Support	Strongly Oppose	Strongly Oppose	--
6	--	--	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't renovate stone barn - expand equestrian use. • Upgrade road access. • No bunkhouse. • Overnight stays in residences
7	Support	Strongly Support	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve access roads and trails, like idea of overnight building or camping • As soon as possible open central and southern hiking • Bird watching
8	Strongly Support	Support	Strongly Oppose	Option C has too much development—too much human footprint. Seems to take away from natural environment
9	Support	Strongly Support	Support	I like Plan "C" but would not want to disrupt the animals and plants in a harmful way.
10	Strongly Oppose	Support	Strongly Support	--
11	Support	Strongly Oppose	Strongly Oppose	--
12	Strongly Oppose	--	--	Oppose using stone floor barn as visitor center.
13	--	--	--	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Want to see use of the existing buildings. Do not use barn for visitor center. • B v C = no food trucks or café • B v C = no overnight in buildings. Camping ok.

PARK AREA: NORTHERN CORE				
Commenter #	Option A	Option B	Option C	Comment
14	--	--	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would prefer parking lot location of "A." • Would prefer visitor center near parking area - new building recycled wood/blending with the farm • Small café (not machines)
15	Support	Support	Oppose	--
16	Strongly Support	Support	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't think that the site as it is now will draw enough people to support the more intensive alternatives. • The place needs more trees • More wildlife habitat, more places to sit, if possible more walkable (smooth) trails.
17	Support	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not clear why overnight accommodation in houses is necessary or desirable; will revenue be worth it? • Develop and upgrade what is there now rather than adding on • Needs to maintain working farm feel and seriously upgrade the native elements which are scarcely visible.
18	Support	Strongly Support	Strongly Oppose	--
19	Support	Strongly Support	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Like the stone floor barn as VC. New VC would be nice but is it necessary? • Support use of existing structures for accommodation and revenue
20	Support	Support	Strongly Oppose	--
21	Support	Support	Strongly Oppose	--

PARK AREA: NORTHERN CORE				
Alternative Option A	4	11	0	2
Alternative Option B	6	8	1	2
Alternative Option C	2	5	2	8

PARK AREA: CENTRAL				
1	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	Oppose	Too many camp sites - when hiking I want to see landscape and not keep running into tents and people eating. One large contained site for ease of management.
2	--	Strongly Support	--	--
3	Strongly Support	Strongly Oppose	Strongly Oppose	--
4	Strongly Oppose	Support	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for more trails, maybe not as many as "C." but we need to plan for as many as possible to disperse use and available future trail openings • "A" does not have enough miles of trail.
5	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Strongly Oppose	--
6	--	--	--	--
7	--	--	--	--
8	Strongly Oppose	Support	Support	--
9	--	--	Strongly Support	--
10	Strongly Oppose	Strongly Support	Strongly Support	--
11	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Strongly Oppose	
12	--	--	--	--
13	--	--	--	--
14	--	Support	--	--
15	Oppose	Support	Strongly Support	--
16	Strongly Support	Support	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Again, I don't think the site warrants intensive development. • I'm concerned about the wooden structures and not tent access creating a location that is focused upon the wealthy

PARK AREA: CENTRAL				
Commenter #	Option A	Option B	Option C	Comment
17	Strongly Support	Oppose	Oppose	--
18	Strongly Support	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	--
19	Support	Strongly Support	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More trails and campsites are great but wildlife and habitat preservation should be the determining factors. • Support individuals back country campsites.
20	Support	Strongly Support	Oppose	--
21	Strongly Oppose	Strongly Support	Oppose	--

PARK AREA: CENTRAL				
Alternative Option A	5	2	3	4
Alternative Option B	6	5	2	3
Alternative Option C	3	2	6	4

PARK AREA: SOUTHERN TIP				
1	--	--	--	--
2	--	Strongly Support	--	--
3	Strongly Support	Strongly Oppose	Strongly Oppose	--
4	Strongly Oppose	Support	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for more trails, maybe not as many as "C." but we need to plan for as many as possible to disperse use and available future trail openings • "A" does not have enough miles of trail.
5	Strongly Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Strongly Oppose	--
6	Strongly Support	Support	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balanced addition of more trails some campsites and equestrian usage. Like ability to hike more miles in southern portion of park. • Tent sites.
7	Support	Support	Strongly Support	More access trails for bird watching.
8	Strongly Oppose	Support	Support	--
9	--	--	Strongly Support	I like more hiking and trail access
10	Strongly Oppose	Support	Strongly Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Master plan for maximum use; you can always not build something. • If you master plan for "A" then want/need more facilities, it's hard to do.
11	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	Strongly Oppose	A very environmentally sensitive area - minimal development. No camping.
12	--	--	Strongly Support	"C" more hiker specific trails would be great.
13	--	--	-	Supports "C" with trails, add to plan "A"
14	--	--	Strongly Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More campsites. Old stone floor barn as interpretive center • Many trails

PARK AREA: SOUTHERN TIP				
Commenter #	Option A	Option B	Option C	Comment
15	Strongly Oppose	Oppose	Support	--
16	Strongly Support	Support	Oppose	Like the other sections, I think less is more appropriate for this area
17	Support	Support	Support	--
18	Strongly Support	Oppose	Strongly Oppose	--
19	Support	Strongly Support	Support	--
20	Support	Strongly Support	Support	--
21	Strongly Oppose	Strongly Support	Oppose	--

PARK AREA: SOUTHERN TIP				
Alternative Option A	4	4	1	6
Alternative Option B	4	7	2	3
Alternative Option C	5	6	3	4

General Comments

Commenter #5

- If park personnel were even to be able to manage this property once it is opened up (without a permit), they will need many more personnel to manage it, and ensure fee collection and rule enforcement!
- If there is a desire to build a new visitor center or restore an old barn then perhaps donated funds can be focused on this to avoid County park taxes increasing.
- I certainly hope this beautiful, unique, one of a kind, rare property will not be degraded in just a short time (decade?) Thank you in advance!

Commenter #8

- As an equestrian myself and one who advocates/represents equestrian interests, I am primarily proposing an expanded trail system with short and long loops, ample parking, water troughs, picnic tables and hitch rails within natural settings. Thank you for providing this workshop for user input.

Commenter #9

- The people putting this project together and presenting it to the public and neighbors have done a wonderful job. The process is well planned and inclusive. Thank you all I feel secure that you are doing the best job possible on a wonderful project.

Commenter #11

- The equestrian community sure has a strong voice. Do they own trail maintenance? As with all parks - the public will come. This area will degrade like the past parks. Look at the use of Taylor Mountain and it has been open how long?

Commenter #12

- Multi-purpose trails should be limited - horses and bikes destroy trails - keep them on the established roads. We don't need another Annadel Park with destroyed trails. Overall I support option "C."

Commenter # 13

- Some trails for hiking only multi use trails are destroyed by bikes and horses.

Commenter #14

- Keep parking as one drives in
- No backtracking of cars
- Keep buildings authentic

Commenter #17

- Strongly support development of more walking and riding trails; more lookouts
- Dogs off leash, hot air ballooning etc. - ridiculous! This is not Disneyland!

Plan Alternatives

Planning Issues	Preferences: Commenter #20	Preferences: Commenter #21
Planning Issue: North Park Entrance Drive	Option A: Improved grading and drainage	Option A: Improved grading and drainage
Planning Issue: Visitor Center	Option A: Renovate Old Stone Floor Barn	Option A: Renovate Old Stone Floor Barn
Planning Issue: Cultural Gathering Area	Option A: Improve existing "Miwok village"	Option A: Improve existing "Miwok village"
Planning Issue: Green House	Option B: Renovate and interpret site	Option C: Renovate for overnight stay
Planning Issue: Yellow House	Option A: Renovate for overnight stay	Option C: Renovate for overnight stay
Planning Issue: Old Stone Floor Barn	Option A: Renovate for Visitor Center	Option A: Renovate for Visitor Center
Planning Issue: Old Dairy Barn	Option B: Preserve framework for interpretation, incorporate equestrian parking	Option C: Reconstruct for Equestrian Center & Visitor Stables and incorporate equestrian parking
Planning Issue: Creamery/Winery	Option A: Stabilize and interpret	Option A: Stabilize and interpret
Planning Issue: Granary	Option A: Renovate for artist-in-residence	Option A: Renovate for artist-in-residence
Planning Issue: Old Shop	Option A: No change (storage)	Option A: No change (storage)
Planning Issue: Tractor Barn	Option A: No change (maintenance storage)	Option A: No change (maintenance storage)
Planning Issue: Storage/Equipment Shed	Option A: No change (equipment shed)	Option A: No change (equipment shed)
Planning Issue: Trails Development	Option B: Expansion of trails	Option C: Extensive new trail system for entire park
Planning Issue: Equestrian Activities	--	Option B: Expand parking & staging at Old Dairy Barn
Planning Issue: Overnight Accommodations	Option A: One home for overnight stays in Cardoza Ranch residence	Option C: Overnight stays in four Cardoza residences, plus new bunkhouse accommodations
Planning Issue: Food Service	Option A: None	Option C: Small café with Ethnobotanical Center
Planning Issue: Single Unit Tent Camping	Option B: Single tent hike-in sites in backcountry	Option C: Expanded single tent hike-in sites in backcountry
Planning Issue: Group or Equestrian Camping	Option A: One hike-in group/equestrian site in backcountry	Option C: Three group/equestrian hike-in sites in backcountry
Planning Issue: Interpreted Historical Ranch Buildings	Option A: Visitor Center at Old Stone Floor Barn, at Green House, and Creamery	Option C: Old Stone Floor Barn
Planning Issue: Park Staff Housing	Leave to park staff decision	Option A: No change (two ranger residences in existing ranch homes)
Planning Issue: Park Maintenance Facilities	Leave to park staff decision	--