

| Title | Question/Comments |
|--|---|
| Wildfire Protection Plan & Trail System | Updating vegetation management plan & community wildfire protection plan have to be done a regular basis-every 3 years? Yes, incorporate single track trails into networks & close heavily eroded trails. |
| | I am not a park user but it doesn't seem wise to incorporate the informal trails into the park trail system. Perhaps they are used mainly by bicyclers. I would prefer to keep land as pristine as possible, better for the preservation of the watershed, & ecology of the area. |
| | Form a clear picture of the county fire department responsibilities and plans for firefighters and evacuations. |
| | Please make all of the comments collected available to the public so that we can see the whole discussion. This is too important to keep behind doors!!! |
| | Separate bikes; different times for bikers; different direction for bikes. |
| | Preservation: The total plan should emphasize preservation in all sections. Search for a better balance between use and preservation. Plan does not now emphasize it enough. Acquire- Restore-Preserve |
| | The Sycamore canyon trail was paved through. How did & what research was done in paving that trail. |
| | Work to remove bike "jumps" off trail. Identify specific "single track" trails that can be used. Discreet mileage and direction signs at all intersections. Decent map that can be printed or distributed/downloaded. |
| | No wild fires |
| | Trail maintenance & creation might possibly require future use of general fund money & this should not be precluded in the Master Plan (especially in newly acquired areas) |
| | Put up "No smoking" signs -thanks |
| | Encourage thought in how to better promote other areas outside loop. Can we develop access from/near La Casitas? |
| | We need more trails like Sycamore Canyon. Normal walking trails for hikers only. Be sure trails do not encroach on wildlife habitats. |
| | Bicycles should be restricted from the loop on weekends. They have many miles of other options. Barring that, a "ride slow" zone. I don't take my small children on the loop ever due to risk of an out of bicycle. JP is far less problematic in this regard. |
| | |
| Park Rangers | Oversight committee is good idea given growth historically and as projected. Program sounds great. |
| | We made cut to Human Services, it is about time we added staff back in starting with paying for Rangers out of general fund. |
| | Charge admission and have rangers monitor. |
| | Better education programming la casitas property. |
| | More stats on what kinds of interface the rangers have with the community. |
| | Yes, increase number of park rangers and ranger program. Be sure not to tie the hands of a future Council w/ respect to use of general fund moneys for this purpose in case it is needed. Create an advisory committee to oversee the implementation of the park master plan especially as more parcels are acquired. Friends-great idea. |
| | Clearer definition of responsibility of friends is needed certainly if we want people to sign up to be friends |
| | Toilets and rangers - strongly approve, hours - please add 1/2 hour in March and October, look to further expansion of the park, name - don't change. Area has special meaning. "wilderness park" is distinctive enough. Name change may open door to policy of no city funding for the park, which I oppose. As just noted: Don't mandate that the park may never receive City funds. I favor expanded parking lots. |
| | Support hiring park rangers- money well spent!!! Could we develop a Jr. Ranger Program/docents like San Dimas Canyon-and advertise! Support scouting projects. |
| | A public oversight committee of Claremont residents & park users would be a valued asset to the park planning and cultural events-including usage. It seems self-evident in a city such as Claremont that public input is a <i>sine qua non</i> (essential) for good use of the park. |
| | Generate more jobs! All for it. Also PRs will assist visitors and enhance safety. |
| | Use girl scouts for education. |
| | Rangers are a good thing, so much better than police enforcement. Friends group will be a help |
| | Definitely support "Friends group" But also definitely see need for another layer of governance-an oversight committee which would hold the city accountable for the implementation of the plan. Too many good plans created in this city have faltered in implementation. |
| | I support this plan. I also think Ranger hours should be shifted to have a presence during peak hours that seem to most perturb neighbors. We could eliminate the privatization of our public streets and allow more parking. |
| | Good Ideas! |

| | |
|--|---|
| | It is absolutely necessary to create an overseer group. The friends of the CHWP would add to the future survival and success of our wonderful land we are overseeing forever. |
| | Ranger Program, Although expensive is the most important future expenditure. If we decide the park needs to be completely self-funding, this should be the last item cut or scaled-back. |
| | Increase Ranger Staff: I strongly support. I approve of giving them greater powers of enforcement and having them work with volunteers; also serving to help educate the public about nature & about appropriate park culture; work closely with "friends of CHWP" I think the senior park ranger could also serve as liaison with community services department on issues involving maintenance. -"Boots on the Ground" & knowledge of immediate conditions & needs should build in as part of governance structure. |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Entry Points & Signage | Yes, a good signage program will help educate and set the tone to improve park culture. Future signage when more parcels are acquired will be needed. |
| | It is very important to have a different sign every month at the gate so everyone knows the hours. I doubt if we need signs within the park. That could be not appropriate for wilderness. The one safety concern is fast bike riding. Could they be given warnings that they could be denied privilege of use if they forget this is an area for families too. |
| | Better signage at the top of the Sycamore Canyon so people know that it links with other trails-e.g.. Johnson pasture or Pomello Road |
| | Way finding signs need to include the direction & distance to closest toilet facility. |
| | I definitely support easement and establishing the signage program. Multilingual is good. |
| | I think that you should go to Sycamore Canyon. |
| | Better signage over birm at Pomello. |
| | Provide a map at Sycamore Canyon with slope information elevation numbers to show how steep it is |
| | Use of Girl Scouts La Casita to access the park |
| | Johnson's Pasture entrance included as part of the plan, provide equal treatment as other entrances |
| | Name change would add cost to signage program |
| | Post trail etiquette signage (proper conduct and behavior). Used to talk to people blaring music. Several labguages (English, Spanish, Chinese) |
| | Multilingual languages cater to a number of cultures. Scan with phone to see further information. |
| | More signage along the back. |
| | Signage at entrance, people to self regulate, don't create another problem,rude people won't pay attention to the signs, don't want to see too many signs |
| | Stay on trail signs |
| | No more signs since it encourages people to use the park. Keep it minimum to discourages people to use overcrowded trail. Use the money on another ranger since people deface signs. Asking for another problem. |
| | Need for signage at Johnson's Pasture. |
| | Sign every month that has opening and closing times. |
| | Concern with speeding bicycles. |
| | Display a map woth main loop, use log to display signs, use nature for signs. |
| | It's time to open the Pomello entrance & make it legitimate. For a mere \$250,000 the city could buy the DeVito Property & circumvent the "no trespassing" at the city. The lot could be monitored by cameras to satisfy the police desire for observation. At the Via Santa Catarina & Mountain entrance The should always be faced with the possibility of a parking lot when they are tired of cars parking on their streets |

| | |
|------------|--|
| RPP | I live on the corner of Mills Ave/Alamosa Dr and over the last several years I have noticed a steady increase in traffic. This was intensified when the Claremont Wilderness Park opened with limited parking forcing park visitors to start parking on the surrounding neighborhood streets. The increased parking and pedestrians on Mills Ave/Alamosa Dr caused traffic and pedestrian safety hazards not to mention the near misses at this intersection. There are no sidewalks on Alamosa Dr. or Mills Ave north of Alamosa Dr. so people were walking in the street. These safety hazards were eliminated after the City installed "No Parking" and "Parking By 'Permit Only'" signs in place permanently or at least until additional parking lots are constructed to accommodate the 1000's of visitors to the CWP. |
| | Please no additional parking lot! |
| | Need to standardize zones throughout the area there are too many different times. |

| | |
|--|--|
| | 3 comments received with concerns that the RPP zones would be in effect on a permanent basis - the need for the zones needs to be received on an intermittent basis, as conditions may change and the need for RPP may also change. |
| | Facilitate establishing even more RPP zones through administration action. These zones have solved one problem but created others. Privatization of public streets should not be seen as the only solution & it sets a dangerous precedent. Why favor northern Claremont residents who live near packing house (congestion, late-night noise, etc.) memorial park, the colleges, O.L.A., U.C.C., etc. - Residents all over Claremont share their streets with! Let's get creative. Think about free parking, but charge admission fee to park (if can't support it through budget) |
| | Don't expand restricted parking area. There is not a fair limit to this kind of thinking in town. Many homes have cars in front of them due to college or city parking. -The challenge is to find a way to get people to pay a reasonable amount for parking as long as spots are available in the parking lot. Don't increase parking fees so much that they drive more & more people to look for street parking. |
| | I don't think the 24/7 parking restrictions are warranted. All limitations to parking should reflect park open times, as park access is more closely controlled. The restricted parking area expansion is a band-aide. |
| | Keep up the good work to help assist wildlife. Keep the community safe and secure with restricted parking. |
| | No zone for Mt Carmel/San Fernando CT/street notifying on the map related to Higgins? System park/sycamore canyon entrance and traffic. |
| | I believe its unfortunate to continue making more public streets restricted. One of the major streets Mills from Pomello South to baseline is definitely wide enough to handle parking and the west side of the street has walls. I would remove the restrictions there. |
| | If surveys are done perhaps it will be possibly to limit restricted parking to morning hours, based on data. Overflow parking on high use days and hours might help. |
| | New RPP's should not be able to be approved by the city's administrative staff. It should require city council & public discussion. It seems like could be an endless process as people are more & more willing to walk further distances. More parking lots, perhaps an admission charge should be considered. Expansion of existing lots is essential. Possibly a remote parking area with shuttle service on Sat. & Sun. mornings would be useful. |
| | Far too RPP use! In 20 years, you want to prevent parking on public streets! The few people who are complaining should not use public parking. What about other parks and schools and tours. M/G allowed for too much acquisitions with the compliances. This errors reflects badly on the components of M/G as a planning firm. |
| | You're just chasing the problem around the city by designating certain lanes "worthy" of special no parking signs. Hikers will go further away and park in front of other homes. Then those owners will complain meanwhile where's the no parking signs for homes along Indian Hill by Memorial Park. Why is parking allowed there? Solution might be to have a shuttle on lot to bring people from a parking lot somewhere else in the city. |
| | These are public Streets/against RPP zones this is an amenity in our community & we should be happy people are using it. |
| | I have a concern about the increased walking on Padua Ave. Since the wilderness Park has increased in popularity the speeds of cars is dangerous.- I no longer feel safe walking on Padua- Sat & Sun cars are going to the I live on Padua and have had to limit |
| | All over Claremont there are parks & other public areas that are heavily impacted with respect to parking. The solution is not to restrict parking on public streets. |
| | I oppose the rpp. All people should have equal access. |
| | Public streets should be for the public. You can take a bus to the park. This is creating a private street situation. People should park but not harass the property owners. |
| | RPP zones might work, but a much better solution is to create more parking lots further away which have reduces or free parking. Keep visitor cars out of residential neighborhoods by providing viable alternatives for parking. |
| | I am offended by restricted parking permits. Where does it stop? People who work in the Sprouts market area park in front of my house. I park on city streets around Memorial Park. We are in this together. |
| | This is not a civic-minded solution to a perceived problem. If over-flow parking lots were built for Saturday & Sunday there might not be a need for this inconvenient, prohibition - that sets a terrible precedence for the rest of Claremont. This just adds to the need for empirical data before prohibition. |
| | I strongly oppose additional RPP zones! They do privatize what are public and publicly supported roads. |
| | I am opposed to expanding any of the Privatized parking zones/ I support abolishing them totally. This privatizes public streets. One stated goal has been pedestrian safety. This policy makes people who can't find parking in the lot or who can't or won't pay walk a long way. They already show their willingness to do so. This is exactly the opposite effect of the stated goal. If noise is the problem; park rangers and/or police hours can be adjusted to encourage quiet parking. |
| | I'm not in favor of parking on street parking except perhaps in a limited area at peak use times. Let's expand the lower lot for over flow parking. |
| | Facility changes: Toilets should stay by the entrance, spike strips are not necessary, there should be another parking lot & there should be a charge or entrance fee. No sign at Pomello to park; it only encourages more to use the entrance and there will be parking problems in more areas. |
| | In order to prevent off - parking lot parking, and to encourage off-peak use, should we the city be providing a percentage of funding, and making parking free Monday-Friday? Why should this area be entirely self-sufficient and reliant on fees? |
| | Expand present parking lots for "peak" parking (Meg Mathias has some details here) and go easy on permit parking; the less the better. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | Why should people who live near the CHWP be allowed to completely control the parking on their public streets; Those who live near the colleges or the village or schools have the same parking issues, but I guess they don't rate as much as people in big houses do. |
| | I think there is no need for further street signs and larger areas of restricted parking. The zone Z areas will only be impacted weekend mornings and that's parallel to the way people near Memorial park are impacted Monday nights for the concerts. They can tolerate it and frankly not that many people park that far away from the loop. People consider the walkers more if you want a balance between the residents and the walkers concerns. |
| | Make all residential parking permits start/stop times of days consistent for zones "B", "C", "D", & 1/ Zone "Z" for Saturday & Sunday use only. |
| | I do not support continue or expanding the parking restrictions on area streets surrounding the park. If continued, as they likely will be, I would like the cost of the signs to be paid for via assessments on the area/district parcels and not from City-wide funds; I consider parking lot revenue City-wide. Other items are more critically supported by that revenue; like the park ranger program. If residential parking permits continued to be required, they should be available to all Claremont residents (like the lot passes). |
| | I strongly object to no street parking in zone 1 and 2. These are deep lots. Parking on these streets will minimize impact of these residents. The restriction of parking in zone 2 is especially objectified - it's the whole north section of Claremont. |
| | Restrictive parking in a community challenges the definition of a community. Why is Claremont going this counter-community route? I am against it. |

| | |
|--|--|
| Intro, Background, Resource Management Plan | While I find much to applaud in the draft of the Master Plan for the Claremont Wilderness Park, I find the overall tone of the document could be much more positive. Much of the plan reads like a series of problems to be solved or managed without recognizing what a wonderful asset the Park is to the City of Claremont and the surrounding region. Hillside parks and open space serve much of the same purpose as beaches do in Southern California. While not everyone is fortunate enough to live in close proximity to either open hillside spaces or wonderful, California beaches, they are treasured resources that should be available to all. The California beaches are public and not private; those who live at the beach must permit access to those who do not. The same should apply to the publicly owned open space in our foothills and local mountains. The recent designation of the San Gabriel Mountains National Monument is further testimony for the need to expand open space opportunities for residents and to manage this resource wisely, just as we are concerned about managing coastal resources. The Master Plan needs a stronger statement of vision not only for the Claremont Hills Wilderness Park but a statement that recognizes the role this park plays in managing open space across our foothill communities. This vision should imagine what a series of contiguous parks along with the National Monument might look like over the coming two or three decades. The Master Plan should unabashedly celebrate the success that the CHWP has enjoyed over its relatively brief existence and boldly imagine how the success might be expanded and coordinated with open space initiatives in our neighboring communities. The Plan should take credit for what Claremont has achieved to date and sketch out a commitment to expansion and improvement over the coming decades. Like the Claremont Colleges, Rancho Santa Ana Botanical Garden, summer concerts in Memorial Park, Claremont 4th of July, and a revitalized downtown, the CHWP has become an integral part of what makes Claremont special and distinctive. The early pages of the Master Plan should make this contribution abundantly clear. |
| | The management plan should stress the importance of the park area being part of the watershed area for the San Gabriel River. |
| | Agrees with feedback-Not enough discussion of watershed and importance of water resources throughout the plan. Parking issues have gotten too much attention and taken from the water issues related to the CHWP and long range availability of water. |
| | Parking on Saturday and Sunday a.m. is discriminatory for people who are only able to use the Wilderness on weekends i.e. working people. Don't lock parking lots an hour before closing; 30 minutes is enough. The \$10 cost is crummy for the same reason. Don't raise rates-daily or yearly. Retired people and those who live close get a better deal because they are likely not have to come Saturday or Sunday mornings. No on name change. Use the savings toward overflow parking. I loved Johnson's Pasture best when were could go monthly/year around on moonlight hikers with the Sierra Club with no emergencies, btw. In 2000, I joined CNC. We hope we can acquire land along the Foothills to save for critters both people and animals. Education is more important than law enforcement. Don't focus on the negative aspects & crabby neighborhoods. |
| | Palmer Canyon incorp.. Solution seems short-term. Consider alt. entrances/parking access distt. for RPP areas, doesn't like RPP, too much emphasis on parking, impacts of El Nino/flooding. |
| | Definitely incorporate single track trails into a network and close other to prevent erosion. Need community involvement both for oversight of implementation plan and for involvement in implementation tasks |
| | 2008 grading will it be fixed? Via Padua area woddles still there |
| | What about fire training trails at North Mills entrance? Open or closed? Make a decision now about which trails to incorporate into the system of designated trails. |
| | Name: (open space) Why change name-wilderness area this park is not. Save some costs. |

| | |
|--|--|
| | Vision and Park Stewardship: Park visitors are an asset, not a burden. The carrying capacity study (Master Plan 2.24) shows minimal damage to loop trail. |
| | Red Flag Closures (5.2.12); vegetation management to mitigate fire risk, (5.2.23), and development of CWPP (5.2.24). I strongly support these efforts. With global warming, the prolonged drought and the closeness of our adjacent neighborhoods. We are in a vulnerable position. Resource Management Plan- lots of good background (except that some surveys are missing key information). The 8 specific recommendations at the end of the chapter provide a good framework for future actions. These cannot be accomplished immediately. It would be wise to specify a tentative timeline and to search (proactively) for funds to support them (in other words prioritize). 3.6.3 (Fire Management) should be top; then maybe 3.6.4 (unauthorized trails) and ways to integrate trail networks (see 5.2.22) An advisory group of stakeholders could be useful in determining priorities and monitoring progress. Governance/Management/Oversight- guiding principle #6 (p 1-6 in draft MP): "Public collaboration is integral to ensure sound policy decision making, and to provide opportunities for the community to contribute their knowledge, expertise, and energy to actively support park management". A new city committee should be established with official status to meet regularly. It should include representatives of various stakeholder groups and be advisory to C&HS Commission and staff. |
| | I don't think the name should be changed-it is not a "wilderness area" and too expensive. It would be nice to have a separation between walkers and bikers could use the "single track" trails be improved/expanded into a bike loop? Increasing parking fees inhibits access and makes it more likely that people would park elsewhere. I don't see why Zone 1 RPP is appropriate- Zone 2 addresses the peak period congestion problem. Why does the Wilderness Park have to be "self supporting" when other parks are not? If there is enough money in the General Fund in the future, there should be a way to use it for park improvement/expansion. More emphasis on co-operation with neighboring cities to acquire property to expand hillside area and this might reduce congestion if there were more trails available so people would not have to drive here for access. |
| | The plan contains separate funding provisions and restrictions (such as no use of General Fund money) which should not be "adopted" or restrict future consideration of changes. Rather these should be "accepted" for the present-if appropriate. General Fund support should be available now, as for other Claremont parks and ongoing. Consider hanging signs engraved on rocks. This is done in South Africa (for example) and is very attractive and effective. I could probably find pictures to illustrate this. This plan is poorly crafted in vision for the future. There should be more consideration of and planning for future additions such as the Thompson Creek Spreading Grounds (a \$200,000 study "TCSG Acquire, Restore, Preserve: for the League of Women Voters (2010) was not even mentioned in the planning document. Addition to the Wilderness Park is proposed in this study as a low impact area where water spreading can be increased and natural ecosystems preserved. The control of visitors through parking fees and restrictions is not working well now and it should be abandoned not enhanced. Instead develop an entrance charge though to use the park. Tickets could be issued to prove entrance fee had been paid (automated) and possibly monitored on occasion (as is done with metrorail fees). Passes could be available for frequent users and/or Claremont residents. Even now the parking situation is terrible. "No Parking" restrictions are to extend all the way to Baseline. Resource Management: This being an important part of over watershed should be given more emphasis, including the connection with the Thompson Creek spreading grounds where this water is handled. Plan for integration of future additions. Don't rename the Park. It is not a wilderness area and the rest of renaming would be wasted money. |
| | With all the arguments, especially about parking, lets not lose focus on the fact that this is a wonderful park that provides experiences with nature that many visitors would not otherwise have. Also, its an affordable (at least if they don't raise the fees) place to exercise-especially for those who can't afford a gym membership. Preserve what we have! |
| | Car parking counts. |
| | Need to collect meaningful data and make management decisions based upon "facts" i.e. operating hours- do we have more crime after dark than day time or more injury? What do rangers do? Any data to support additional hires? |
| | Park is a community treasure. The number of visitors have not damaged the park and they become true advocates for preservation of nature. We need a strong and broad vision for the future including expansion-purchase of adjacent parcels. We all benefit due to watershed protection. |
| | I agree with the concern about the watershed. Much work has been done on the Claremont watershed and the report does not seem to coordinate with that information. We are increasingly going to need to capture water runoff when we can no longer depend upon the snow pack. |
| | It's very important to emphasize the importance of not only sustaining the Claremont Hills Wilderness Park as it now exists but also to actively pursue possibilities for expanding the park to link up with other wilderness areas and persuade natural corridors in the Foothills for nature critters. |
| | Be sure to study past work studies done. Specifically plan for water pressure action and use. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | The number and extent of invasive species is underestimated. A better survey needs to be done. "90%" contains native vegetation types " is misleading and unclear. How large was the study area? An acre with mostly non-native and a few natives might count as part of the study area, percent cover for native species might be a better measure. Non-native thistles also have a great likelihood of creating a significant effect. In some significant effect. I'm sure none of these 159 acres of non-native vegetation exist. |
| | I strongly support all these resource management ideas! |
| | Resource Management: Let's emphasize the CHWP as a community, asset-i.e. the positive aspects of the parks impacts on our community. The Master Plan should also be revised to express a vision for expanding the park as opportunities to do so to develop over the next two decades. |
| | Vision: The Master Plan should include a stronger commitment to expansion of the park and to coordination with neighboring communities to create continuous space corridor along the Foothills. Vision and Park Stewardship: park visitors are an asset, not a burden. The carrying capacity study (Master Plan 2.24) shows minimal damage to loop trails. |
| | Purpose and Resource Management: I was awed by my experience surveying last summer at the Mills entrance. There were so many families entering, grandparents, parents, toddlers. There were so many people from communities with different skin colors than Claremont. It was joyful. I was proud that Claremont has offered these hillside roads to the regional community. We are so different from the selfishness of Rancho Cucamonga and La Verne. I would be against charging for the walk in the park-just as I would be for a walk on the beach. However, I can see a reason for charging for the service of a parking lot. I've been convinced that money generated from parking fees would be important for supporting park costs not only ranger enforcement but for resource management. |
| | Sustainable Funding: Why must CHWP be self-supporting? City Councils now and in the future, should be able to allocate adequate funds for staff etc. as needed. |
| | The CHWP will survive best if it is conceived in a larger picture, one that enhances links to the neighboring hillsides and to the San Gabriel Mt. Monuments to the north. The place needs positive language about this relationship. |
| | Management operation and Maintenance: it would be better to have a data driven governance plan to resolve the issue of financial support. |
| | Background, Manage Plan: Its great we have so many visitors to the park, they are future advocates and outdoor educators. This is a need to expand the park access to the hillsides. I hope incorporation of more hills will be a priority. We need a plan with a big vision of next several decades. Master Plan Purpose, Mng: Why must CHWP be self-sustaining? Lets have an option posture towards funding-looking at all our parks. |
| | Add SPL status spp. From Bonterra Psomas rpt. Map to RMP. |
| | Main loop trail does not cross Burbank Trail. Rancho Ana Herbarium historic data. Naomi Fraga [...] for this info. |
| | Don't rename the park. It is not a wilderness area and the cost of renaming would be wasted money. |
| | Corrections for Master Plan for CHWP: 1. Pg. 1-4 (1st paragraph) add: preserve the park as an environmental resource, with special attention to its function as watershed for the aquifers serving cities of the San Gabriel Valley. 2. Pg. 1-5 Guiding Principles "decision-making for the next 20 years or more" Add new paragraph: President Obama in 2015 designated 346,000 acres of our mountainsides as the San Gabriel Mountains National Monument to be managed jointly by the National Forest Service and the National Park Service. This designated land adjoins Claremont Hills Wilderness Park. Congresswoman Judy Chu anticipates possible future assistance with management issues and funding. Claremont should plan to cooperate actively with these agencies. 3. Add paragraph, Additional acquisitions: From time to time land parcels in the hillsides north of Claremont become available for sale. Claremont and CHWP should be prepared to make active efforts (with possible aid from Trust from Public Land) to acquire all appropriate such land to protect our northern fringe from development. Remove the statement which forbids use of General Funds for Wilderness Parklands. This should be a working document which will be modified as times change, and there is no such restriction on other City properties. A practical fact is that State or Federal funds for purchase, development, upkeep, even though granted, usually require that City pay for purchase or work, which is then reimbursed. |

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| | <p>4. Add paragraph: A \$200,000 State Bond financed Feasibility Study, "Thompson Creek Spreading Grounds: Acquire, Restore, Preserve" made under auspices of League of Women Voters of Claremont Area with assistance from Three Valleys Municipal Water District, was completed in Dec. 2010. Purchasing Thompson Creek Spreading Grounds from its owner, PVPA, is still anticipated. There has been an assumption that the land and the management of its water resources would go to the City of Claremont, as another addition to CHWP. However, that agreement is not formalized at present. Add: Thompson Creek, with its tributaries from Cobal, Williams, and Palmer Canyons is the easternmost tributary of the San Gabriel River. This is important as there is state funding for San Gabriel watershed protection. Furthermore, the new \$7.5 billion water bonds are now beginning to be released (Prop 1). The Thompson Creek Project (above) is listed as one of the State's Integrated Regional Water Management Projects. We have been told that the City's Johnson Pasture bonds can be counted as matching funds if those are required. 5. At 3.4.4 Archaeological Field Survey-Be sure your Final Report list accurately: The City of Claremont has a professional Archaeological Study of the CHWP made in 1996, printed as App. B of the Claremont Hills Wilderness Park Management Plan. It states: "Eight survey and excavation sites were found within a quarter mile radius of the project area and one within the area. "Due to the sensitive nature of cultural resources, archaeological site locations are not released. "Our office recommends that as ground disturbing activities are planned for a project area, a professional archaeologist be retained to conduct a Phase I archaeological survey on all visible ground surfaces. Relatively little cultural resources work has been conducted for the project area, which makes sensitivity difficult to evaluate. The presence of several intermittent streams within the project area would have made portions of the project area suitable for the prehistoric habitation."</p> |
| | <p>6. The Master Plan list of Endangered species is quite incorrect, omitting important species and being incorrect on others. Consult Naomi Fraga, Environmental Botanist, Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden (909/625-8767, x 231) 7. Parking: DO NOT now raise parking fees beyond present rates. Doing so will push more people into walking in, or using other entrances. I was there Sunday morning 9:30 three weeks ago. Both parking lots were only lightly used, and dozens of people were walking up the sidewalk from who knows where? Clearly, you are already scaring people out of coming. Furthermore, higher rates are really discriminatory! Parking and RPP zones. The Plan's provision for restricted parking is likely to spread to almost all of northern Claremont, around other entrances, as well as schools, etc. This will become an absurdity. it cannot possibly be a plan with 20 year vision of the future.</p> |
| | <p>8. The budget allotment for Rangers is unnecessarily high, but still unrealistic, not having made estimates for annual car operating expenses, new uniforms when rangers are replaced, employee benefits., educational materials. This plan is a real waste of anticipated but not assured money. No reason to think the City needs part-time employees hanging around up there to tell people to be nice. Make good signs. Enforce from time to time (though rarely) with a uniformed officer. I have volunteered at the Botanic Garden for 30 years. There are now more than 200 working volunteers with only one 1/2 time coordinator; we pay for our own uniforms and materials. We run the entrance kiosk, lead school and adult tours, work in greenhouse, do other important work, and don't waste picking up paper and reminding people to stay on the trails. I've hiked National Parks for 70 years; never had a ranger watching over me! Claremont does not need a collection of paid Rangers watching the Park and its visitors.</p> |
| <p>Sign in Table</p> | <p>I have lived in Claremont for 30 years on and off. 3 years ago we moved into a quiet neighborhood off Mills-specifically for the quiet and wildlife. Please keep the current parking restrictions. It is different if you buy a house next to Memorial Park or the high school. As you know this before you buy. This is difference as this came to us-rapidly and severely. We would have bought someplace else, had we known this. We stopped hiking in the quiet and serene wilderness park after the crowd started coming as there no longer feels like "wilderness" its feels like a parking lot and amusement park.</p> |
| | <p>1. I was glad to hear TAC mention Facebook and the use of cell phones to purchase permits. As I look at 4.2.1, Public Outreach, I would hope the City really explores all the electronic and/or social media ways of getting the word out. Ask young out of town park users how they find out if the park is open, etc. Also applies to 5.2.8. 2. Re 5.2.12 Red Flag Closure, I assume this very significant measure doesn't preclude emergency closures for other public safety issues-flooding? Crime? Should the plan make it clear that other causes might apply, and who calls the shots CPD? City? Etc.3. I support the comment about seeing the park in the wider context of the land around. What happens in Marshall Canyon, etc. might impact CHWP.</p> |
| | <p>Thanks for what you do. As discussed, there is a concerned group of neighbors on and around Mt. Carmel dr. In particular the safety of neighbors and visitors to the park during peak hours. It's not a question of if someone will gets hurt. It's a question of when. Thanks again.</p> |
| | <p>I am deaf and use cochlear implants to hear. For a hearing impaired person it is very difficult to hear/understand someone who is talking "away" from him or her. I understand that the plan presenters were primarily addressing the committee. However, it would have been very simple to arrange the room so that the presenters were facing the audience and the committee members. Then public is included in meetings it is important that acoustics be considered.</p> |
| | <p>I am a long term user of this trail (since early 1980's). I am thrilled with the growing use by families. The length of the loop seems perfect for the challenges of even younger children. It is a fine use of our resources.</p> |
| | <p>RPP is evidence of the City's failure to charge appropriately for use of the park. If entry had a price, it would discourage use and make RPP unnecessary. Master Plan- since about 80% of users are not Claremont residents, Claremont has recreated a regional park but Claremont residents have to shoulder most of the maintenance and liability cost. Not fair. Charge entry for non-Claremont residents.</p> |

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| | Parking-too expensive. We need a parking lot in Claraboya to take pressure off Mills, North and South lots. Name Change to Wilderness Area a great idea. "Park" gives a sense of public recreational entitlement. |
| | Please consider signage in natural materials such as large rocks or boulders. A World Heritage site in Africa uses them (for large and small amounts of material) to very good effect. They enhance the environment (whereas current signage mars it) and make becoming informed a fairly pleasant process. Reading our current signs is aversive in most uses. P.S. Be more concerned about the future-stay flexible enough to keeping opportunities and dangers. |
| | Red Flag Closures brilliant! Why would Claremont want to second guess, LA County? This avoids the need to make a closure decision and reduces City liability. |
| | RSABG has a volunteer program that works well and from which CHWP should/could draw lessons. Turnstiles seem unnecessarily obstructive and out of character. We should certainly maintain a good relationship with LACo Fire Dept. but I question the implanting the needing improve it-make it good-cooperate. Habitat is more important than trails or public use. Most informal trails should not be upgraded-maybe eliminated? Conservation/preservation of the environmental resources should be top priority. |
| | I submitted some comments on a blue card at the last TAC meeting, but have since read the Claremont Wilderness Wildlands Conservancy responses and would like to in general support their thoughtful input. 1. I particularly support the concept of regional open space and the need to build "a strong network with neighboring communities and governments to expand and maintain an extensive open-space corridor. 2. I also agree with CWC questioning why the CHWP should be such a tiny part of the City budget. Budgeting for City staff time and ongoing surveys sounds sensible, too. In my fantasy, Claremont businesses would handout coupons as hikers left the park, more folks would patronize local businesses, and the tax coffers would swell! Or your parking receipt would earn you a free drink at many restaurants. 3. A standing advisory committee makes sense. 4. A trail assessment plan (5.2.22) that involves closing some trails while integrating others is sensible. Sycamore Canyon doesn't need a new trail; it needs improvement of the current trail. 5. I'll stay neutral on the parking issues! |
| | |
| Parking Lots | I agree that \$10 is so high that it will drive people to park elsewhere and create unintended problems. It is not really a solution. We should find a solution for more shuttle supported parking perhaps, which would cost less than \$10. Shuttles could be during only the fitted-lot times. |
| | The congestion parking rates will, even more so, limit access to our valuable resource. Why not add parking (at a more reasonable amount) near Padua park? \$10-parking for a 1-2 hour hike (that is good for society) is ridiculous as we should be ashamed. |
| | The proposed increase in fees are not justified & could be counter productive. The \$324,000 of the received General Fund from parking fees are currently covering essentially all of the park costs. Overflow parking on weekends could solve the parking issue on crowded days. The City should not require that only parking fees should pay for park maintenance. The projected annual park expenses are only around 1% of the City's budget. Certainly the City can afford to supplement the parking fees. |
| | I support increase in meter and visitor permit fees-but only if some plan is put forward to create overflow parking issues-Take all those visitor cars off local streets. Extra fees on weekends are discriminatory. |
| | oppose congestion parking. |
| | 1. Eliminate all parking fees open both main entrance lots to all. 2. Open up all parking along Baldy Rd and Mills Ave where parking are not in front of residents. 3. Paid parking is discriminatory to those who can't readily afford to pay due i.e. unemployed |
| | I oppose raising prices for parking. If you have free parking it needs to extend to closing time. Will people pay for the last hour or two? \$140 is way too much even \$100 asks a lot. Lets keep good relationships with our users by not changing our price structure at this time. Probably these prices shouldn't be in a long term plan anyways. A year or two later who would raise prices if necessary. |
| | Why does this park have to pay for itself? |
| | 1. "Congestion parking fees" are discriminatory and counter to the notion of the public good. The WP is a wonderful resource for all in the area. It is appalling to charge fees for the park. Why are you not charging to play in all the park of Claremont? 2. INC \$ parking encourages parking elsewhere- simply redistricting the problem. 3. Why doesn't Claremont take a full leadership role in this area and build a process that encourages healthy communities? Parking fees privilege the wealthy, white people force less fortunate people to fear the cost disproportionately. |
| | Free time should be noon to closing, not noon to 4pm. |
| | Bad idea to charge more for parking on Saturday and Sunday. I think the Von's parking lot will get impacted as more people look for free parking spots. |
| | There should be free parking at the Mills entrance and an entrance fee for the park. A. It would end the problem of neighborhood parking because there would be nothing to gain by parking farther away. B. Even a small entrance fee would create a larger income for park maintenance. C. It is fair that all users pay equally . |
| | Invest in no additional parking, open space is more important. Alternatives like shuttles or public transport is a better option. The parking lots need to find staffing and better maintenance, not parking mitigation. |

| | |
|--|--|
| | Parking fees should not be raised. Revenue from fees is high already, and a 40% increase is way too much. The fact that it will cost more neighborhood parking issues is significant. The environmental impact on the park with the high number of users has been minimal. This fee increase seems to be motivated by the need reducing number of users. Why do we need to reduce the number of users? The park should not be required to be self-sufficient in terms of fee revenue and operating costs. No other park in Claremont has this requirement. |
| | Oppose increasing daily fee/annual permit - either might have the unintended consequence of not using parking lots. This particularly applies to congestion parking. Exploring other options seemed lacking: No suggestions for increased parking, only limiting parking use. What data has been collected on spaces in the overflow parking at the sports park? There is continuously available paved sidewalks from there to North Mills. |
| | Sometimes I walk into the park for a quiet half hour among the oak groves. Shutting the parking lot down a full hour before closing would deprive me of one of the great meditative pleasures of my life. Please don't do this. Its unreasonable to close the park during March to October a full hour before dusk. Adding a half hour during these months of daylight-saving-time transition is logical & give hikers a chance to get out of the park in a reasonable way. I would be ashamed of Claremont if we charged a \$10 fee on Saturday and Sunday mornings-Surely a signal that we think rich people have a right to hike when it's cool & poor people to hike when its hot (Sunday p.m. & Monday p.m.). At the very least, it will encourage folks to look for other portals into the park. The parking lot fees are providing an adequate stream of money NOW. Why mess around with it? If more money is needed in the future (or inflation says the value of what exists) then the price of fees can be adjusted. This is why we need flexible language in the MP and a governance structure for decision-making. It makes good sense to provide more parking -espec. on Sat. & Sun. mornings (so-called over-flow parking.) Hey, the city already owns land adjacent to the south Mills parking lot. Surely the PVPA could be asked about the land in the north parking lot or the city could buy DeVitoto trade with PVPA. |
| | 1. The free parking should start earlier on Sunday and Monday, perhaps at 9 a.m. . This would be a better inducement for some people to delay their arrival until after the peak. 2. Re-open the Mills dirt parking lot, where the boulders are now. 3. Re-open Baldy Rd. parking from Mills eastward. |
| | The current parking fee should be continued. Higher fees will likely drive more people to use the surrounding residential area for parking |
| | Before raising fees, I believe the city should increase parking space by expanding current lots. The city should also explore the PVPA land adjacent to the North lot for supplementary parking, plus the land to the east and south of the lot and consider shuttles. |
| | Please keep fees the same and not raise prices which will make it difficult for young people or not so privileged people to come and enjoy the area. |
| | People go on-line to get pass for admission and permits are free. They are the limiting factor. This would be done via software. Then people would still pay for parking without an increase on-line to the parking fees. Should have overflow parking which would allow for more parking. |
| | Congestion Pricing on Sat & Sun. Mornings: No! 1. Discriminates against lower socio-economic folks. 2. Will cause people to park on streets, even farther away, and walk thru neighborhoods. 3. Trade-off of "free periods" in afternoons is not equivalent (hot period/work conflict). Peak period problem would be better solved by providing adequate overflow parking adjacent to current lots. (make it ungraded, gated and use only as needed.) There is appropriate land available. Raising fees \$3 -> \$5 daily, \$100 - \$140 annual NO-Leave fees at current level. 1. Most people spend 1-2 hrs to walk or run fire-roads with minimal amenities-not the same as a daily fee for a park where you might spend 1/2-1 day with picnic, playground, etc. 2. Annual fees for parks shown in Att. 5 are not comparable-most of them buy passes to a park system with multiple parks. 3. should make annual fee available for 6 months (\$50) and advertise better. |
| | I suggest adding 30 minutes to the parks' open hours in March and October to match dusk. I also suggest locking the entrance gate only 30 minutes prior to closing time each day. The proposed suggestion to close the gate 1-hour prior to closing time deprives citizens of a significant amount of time in the park. Regarding parking fees, I oppose raising the parking fee from \$3 to \$5 and suggest that the annual fee remain at \$100. These fees are more reasonable for people who want to take a walk in the woods. I think that a "congestion parking fee" be applied during peak periods on Saturdays and Sundays, but the \$10 suggested fee is way too high and thus discriminatory. If the regular fee is \$3 as I suggested above, I think that a congestion parking fee of \$6.00 should be applied. The effectiveness of this higher congestion parking fee could then be assessed for a year to see if an increase is needed. |
| | I do not agree with discouraging visitors to the park during open hours. I would not like to charge visitors \$10 during Sat and Sun peak hours, that happens to be when I go hiking. As a resident I understand my permit would be valid during peak hours. I believe the City can provide shuttle services on Mills Ave. |
| | Use entrance fee rather than parking fee. Entrance fee means all pay to keep up the park. Keep any fees at the lowest level possible to maintain and preserve the park. No congestion parking fee (Sundays) unfair to wrkg people. Avoid developing "private" streets by restricting parking on certain sts. |
| | Perhaps the plan could include the idea of creating one or two overflow parking lots-to be open for use only during peak visitation hours on Saturdays and Sundays. The overflow lots could reduce the need for people to park on adjacent city streets. Also: Decisions on parking ought to be informed by regularly updated data. Do we know how the most recent change in parking regulations have impacted use of parking lots? Current data should inform park policy and the master plan should budget for regular data collection. |
| | I would be against any increase of parking fees. You would be prohibiting many people from participating in a wonderful wilderness park. The fee for our parks is only for one area, unlike fees that are collected in other areas of the state are for many areas i.e.. State parks, etc. |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>Disagree with \$10.00 fee on Saturdays and Sundays. Parking permits make sense. Don't agree with increase in fees. Need to plan to address overflow parking on weekends. Advertise on website more options for parking options.</p> |
| | <p>One side of Pomello has no houses, also one side of upper Mills. With a little work that space could be opened for parking and take pressure off the walkers who can't get into the parking lots. Think about it!</p> |
| | <p>Please have the spike strips rubberized so that they are not so loud as cars drive over them.</p> |
| | <p>Parking restrictions should not be eased! The parking issues are the most disruptive to residents. I support increased fees.</p> |
| | <p>\$10.00 pricing is too high! When I surveyed, many people appeared to be of modest means. \$140 for an annual pass is wrong-headed. Way too high. Now that parking is restricted in adjacent neighborhoods, is the parking problem solved? Overflow parking on high-use days is necessary. \$10 will encourage use of spaces elsewhere or use of other entrances.</p> |
| | <p>Prefer retaining current name of this amazing natural place-i.e. Claremont Wilderness Park. Parking lots could be increased in size available for peak periods- rather than increasing parking fees. (explore nominal admission fee at main gate) Support efforts to protect natural watershed and environment of park by removal of invasive species, maintenance of trails, etc. I appreciate that the park is enjoyed by so many people in Claremont and surrounding communities. Support a strong commitment to working with neighboring.</p> |
| | <p>Parking income seems pretty high right now. Do we really need to increase it just because we can. Now that parking area has been paid for should not the \$357,900 be used for maintaining the park and funding some of the things recommended. Let's try overflow parking area before raising prices.</p> |
| | <p>Parking was the issue that triggered the development of the Master Plan and I am not persuaded that the solution offered in the draft is likely to provide a satisfactory remedy. Part of the difficulty is that the plan is counting on the parking policy to solve too many issues - providing adequate access for users, protecting neighbors from congestion in their neighborhood, and generating revenue sufficient to meet all of the ambitious goals of the plan. My reading of the proposed solution is that it is weighted heavily in favor of protecting neighbors from congestion, that it is likely to curtail access to the park for those who would like to use it and that it is also not likely to generate sufficient income to maintain the park and implement the plan. My expectation is that the neighbors are happy with this outcome but most users and other Claremont residents will find it objectionable. By raising daily parking fees from \$3-\$5, raising annual fees from \$100 to \$140, and charging a most inappropriate fee of \$10 on weekend mornings (under the guise of so-called congestion pricing), one is sending a very strong signal that park users, particularly those of modest means, are unwelcome at the CHWP. The Plan argues that these fees are in line with other comparable parks but the comparisons offered are most inappropriate. The annual fees cited are fees for systems of multiple parks-state, county, regional-and most of these are well below \$140. For example, an annual pass for all Wilderness Parks in Orange County is sold for \$55. Many of the state and regional parks offer much more in the way of amenities and people expect to spend full days at the park as opposed to a couple of hours walking "the loop." The appropriate day use comparison in Orange County is \$3 for parking in Wilderness Parks and \$1.50 per hour for county beach parks (or annual pass for \$55). I could find no examples of the congestion pricing, let alone a fee as high as \$10. It is far from clear that these increased fees will result in increases revenues, revenues that currently are so crucial to the maintenance of the park and implementation of the Master Plan. Will raising annual fees from \$100 to \$140 result in more sold or less? If the latter, revenues will fall. If raising fees from \$3 to \$5 merely results in fewer people visiting the park or parking and entering the park from other points, again revenues will fall. These increases are offered to us with no empirical data to support them so we cannot be sure what impact will be. It is hard not to draw the conclusion that the primary reason for raising fees is to keep people from using the park, an outcome certain to bring smiles to the neighbors. Coupled with residential parking restrictions that will prevent parking in front of 500 houses near the park, the number of users is surely bound to fall. And, if approved, the City Council will now surely encourage other residential areas that have long experienced parking in their neighborhoods-near schools, parks, the Colleges, near downtown businesses-to ask for relief. While I do not deny that neighbors of the CHWP have experienced considerable congestion on the weekends, I wonder if there is not a better way forward. One approach would be to keep parking fees at the current rate and actually lower annual fees to encourage more regular users to purchase them. Particularly during the week, if regular users (and holders of annual passes) went straight to the parking lots, there would be very modest impact in the neighborhoods. Residential parking restrictions might then be limited to the weekend. If an adjacent unimproved lot could be made available along Mt. Baldy road east of the south lot, they might be opened on the weekend to accommodate larger numbers of users. One important Master Plan conclusion is that the current number of users of the CHWP is not having a detrimental impact on the environmental resources of the park. There is not a good case to be made for limiting access. I would hope that the Master Plan through its parking policy would not unwittingly or otherwise keep people from enjoying all that the park has to offer.</p> |
| | <p>The Master Plan recommends maintaining current park hours. CWC proposing adding 30 minutes to the parks open hours in March and October to match dusk; results in additional 30 hours of visitor use per year. - The Plan would lock the entrance gate 1 hour</p> |

CHWP Master Plan 9-28-15 Community Meeting Comment Cards Summary

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <p>Management Plan</p> | <p>Funding: MP states no support of CHWP from City's General funds. 1. This should not be part of the 20- year Master Plan. Don't tie hands of future City Councils; Retain financial flexibility. 2. At least some support (if not all) should come from City parks budget; Development funds, Landscape & Lighting, Etc. 3. If park must be at least partly self-supporting, consider alternative of charging admission fee & making parking free. This would solve negative impact on neighbors & could bring in more money. Also we could eliminate RFP's.</p> |
| | <p>Concerned that there should be a more defined, identified structure for governance. With two departments involved physical issues and ranger issues and roles, will the public know how/to whom problems should be reported? A broad-based committee to provide input to a decision-Making a management team/chair and funding should not be dependent only on citations & fees. Why are fees from developers used only for urban parks? Vision: Should address future acquisitions to the park and have a "point" staff person to be aware of possible properties for sale. Awareness of opportunities to work with neighboring communities on environmental issues broader than our own land ownership.</p> |
| | <p>Great idea to incorporate some single tract trails into usable trail list. Bad idea to install turnstile or spike strip at lot entrance. Do not rename park to wilderness area. It is a park. Support increased hours for March and October. Against fees for parking (permit and annual permit). Against congestion fees. Support Pomello easement and signage. Support more and consistent signage.</p> |
| | <p>Facility: No turnstile! ugly, weird looking. No spike strip either. Trail system-more single track trails are a good idea. Name change: not recommended. Future Acquisitions: Incorporate into the park. Park Rangers program-add staff, apply for grants. They are out there-use money for staff rather than for turnstiles. Fees-don't raise fees. People use the loop to improve their health and should not be penalized.</p> |
| | <p>The Master plan should address the goal to increase the size of the parks as private adjacent land becomes available. This will help avoid development in the area and help create an animal corridor for animals east to west.</p> |
| | <p>No Policeman.</p> |
| | <p>There should be an advisory committee to help monitor the management of the park and be able to give input and suggestions to the City. An important and very important function should be the collection of data regarding park usage. The name of the park should not be changed to "Wilderness Area." This is a park, part of the Claremont park system. The name change implies this is a true wilderness which is isn't. It will confuse people who might think they will need a permit to enter.</p> |
| | <p>Purpose, etc-I hope that those making current plans for CHWP will take a long-term view of the park and it should remain a "park", not a wilderness "area," as "park" sounds more people - and family friendly. The long-term view should include preservation of the park as a wild region, with stipulations that no concessions or other marketing temptations start creeping in. We are privileged to have such an unspoiled area so close to our homes that we can enjoy daily. There are many other places where one can find venues for other forms of recreation, leisure, or social functions. Fund-raisers for the park can be held off-site, or be the only exception. It would be wonderful if the park can be expanded with land that becomes available in the future. Owners of empty lots should be encouraged to donate , their land, or grants should be sought to make such acquisitions. I strongly advocate a volunteer program for help with greeting visitors (a kiosk, perhaps, as at the Botanic Garden), some trash pickup, and other light maintenance issues. I would be one of the first to volunteer. Any governing board or committee should include people from all segments of the population, not only the usual Claremont elite.</p> |
| | <p>Definitely need establishment of citizen municipal group to make sure implementation proceeds according to the plan.</p> |
| | <p>Look to the future for watershed aquifers protection of water.</p> |
| | <p>In considering park management, it's important to have an oversight group provided by Claremont citizens - This is a 20+ year plan! There needs to be input provided by citizens on an ongoing basis, with a sense of the long-term issues.</p> |
| | <p>Governance does not seem to be clearly designated in the plan - spread among 2 commissions-comm. Services & Human Services & the Park, Hillsides and Utilities Committee.</p> |
| | <p>Grading of trail creates a fair amount of loose soil and rocks on the trail which could be a hazard. Most of the trail does not need grading only areas prone to erosion.</p> |
| | <p>It does not make sense to have a Master Plan that stipulates that no general fund monies be used to support CHWP. This stipulation restricts future decisions what financing of the park unnecessary. No other park in Claremont has such restrictions. Why should the CHWP? 2) No need to rename CHWP as a Wilderness Area. The funds could be better spent on other parts of the Master Plan. Most stringent, the term "Wilderness Area" has a specific federal gov't designation - one not appropriate for CHWP.</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>The Master Plan needs to better define organizational structure for CHWP management & responsible decision making. I support the Claremont Wild lands Conservations suggestion of an Advisory Group that includes representatives from various stakeholder groups to monitor implementation of the Plans and to ensure public input. Up-to-date empirical data are necessary to inform on-going decision makeup. Hey. This is a master plan meant as a template for decades. Surely we cannot now predict what patterns will be in the future. We must not tie the hands of future City Councils to provide funds above and beyond money generated by parking fees. What would Claremont do, for instance if the park burned and nobody parked? Claremont needs to keep systematic data to support its policies. Here-say is not enough! Believe me, a subcommittee that addresses all city parks is not adequate for governance of the CHWP. How would we ensure representation of all, stakeholders on such a subcommittee. A subcommittee of specially appointed people (neighbors, hikers, bikers, etc) needs to be built into the governance system.</p> |
| | <p>Bicyclist can be very problematic. I'm not sure enough attention has been given on this issue. They're off trail biking creates erosion issues-and the speed of their descent is often very dangerous.</p> |
| | <p>Management, Operations, & Maintenance should include a systematic way to obtain feedback from various stakeholders at regular intervals over time. Recognize the needs of the space will change over time and have flexibility within plan to adapt (i.e. how to partner with La Casitas Girl Scout Camp.) Collaborate with other cities to provide open access.</p> |
| | <p>A permanent representative citizens board should be implemented and consulted in all relevant changes.</p> |
| | <p>There needs to be an oversight group. Things evolve and the nearby neighborhoods have too much control of our city council. We need "outside" oversight to add a level of true oversight for those of us who use it, but don't have control of the City Council.</p> |
| | <p>Great to have some funding but general fund may possibly be needed in the future & should not be disallowed. Need an oversight committee to ensure that the plan's is carried out. Need to know up-to-date facts to support conclusions re parking problems.</p> |
| | <p>Security-We moved to Claremont, specifically Blaisdell Ranch, because the community was quiet, safe, and well kept. The policies of the City have pushed non-residents to park on our streets. They disrespect the residents, are noisy, litter, and steal fruit from the trees. I would ask that you make this right for our neighborhood. Provide an enforceable no parking zone and have police presence. Thanks.</p> |
| | <p>Note: We walk the loop almost everyday - we walk from our house and parking. We live in zone 1, we would like to see parking restrictions without having to have signed petitions and signage. There should be large signs posting trail etiquette. The City posted this in the newsletter, but 80% of trail users are not from Claremont! We are tired of having to move out of the way for wrong way walkers, listening to people blasting their music, and almost being run over by bicycles doing 20mph. Permits: Based on recent checkpoint, we think the majority of dogs aren't licensed. This should be enforced. Permits should be required to walk dogs this could help pay for dog sh** removal! Maybe the City of Claremont can speak with other cities (Glendora, Azusa, Rancho Cucamonga) and have them re-open their trails so we aren't stuck with so many rude people.</p> |
| | <p>The success of any Master Plan depends not only on careful surveys, good assessments, and creative ideas, but also on successful implementation. Such implementation most crucially depends on an effective governance structure, the ongoing collection of empirical data, sound management, and sources of sustainable funding. I am concerned that not enough attention in the current draft has been devoted to ensure successful outcomes. The plan lacks a coherent governance structure for making and implementing decisions. Too much of the implementation is likely to fall on the shoulders of already overworked city staff. Hiring a staff member and appointing a representative advisory body whose primary duties are to attend to affairs of the Park would go a long way toward developing a workable governance structure. The regular collection of data about park use, parking patterns, resource degradation etc... Would make it much more likely that evolving park rules and procedures were based on empirical facts rather than anecdote and uniformed conjecture. Finally, and most importantly, the plan needs to give much more attention to sources of sustainable funding. One embedded assumption needs to be challenged and changed. The assumption that the park must be self-supporting (through the collection of parking fees and parking citations) may be convenient for public officials but it is neither reasonable nor appropriate. No other public park in Claremont is expected to "pay its own way" and neither should the CHWP. When the City agreed to purchase these parcels of open space and indeed asked city residents to help pay for them, it did not do so with the assumption that no subsequent maintenance costs would be incurred. Parking fees can help offset the cost of maintaining the park but denying any monies from the General Fund is irresponsible and unsupportable. The plan should embrace the assumption that the City will pay its fair share of the maintenance costs just as it would expect to pay such costs for a locally owned water company or new police station. Moreover, the plan should envision funding for future open space acquisitions that might include county, state, or other outside funding but would demonstrate Claremont's commitment to the park by a willingness to make an appropriate contribution.</p> |

CHWP Master Plan 9-28-15 Community Meeting Comment Cards Summary

| | |
|--|---|
| Facility Changes | 1. Entry gate and spike strips, not sure this is the image we want to project. Seems unfriendly and unwelcoming. Not consistent with a "wilder ness", 2. Natural. Could \$21k Estimated expense Be better put toward an entrance kiosk where rangers and volunteers would greet visitors and help set tone, improve park culture? 3. Not clear that these address a serious problem that needs solving. What is the evidence? |
| | Like the idea od the composting toilets. Not sure about turnstile,spike strip. |
| | The \$3,000 Kiosk re-location cost should instead go to Dave Roger and City tree planning. |
| | Need a turnstile gate/entrance at Sycamore Canyon entrance. The gate is left wide open 24/7. No zonage for Higgenbotham park area. |
| | No turnstiles. Do not move the kiosk, it's fine where it is. |
| | Open up parking on Mills (w) side. |
| | More Toilets please - top & bottom. Good idea. |
| | I would like to have real bathrooms with multiple stalls in place of the port-a-potties at the base (parking lot) of the park, and more than 1 composting toilet up in the loop where you plan to replace the current port-a-potties. |
| | Please no ugly turnstile for a wilderness park. It create problems for the people who stay late? So what? Their problem, you can't guarantee everyone safety. It needs to be wild, that's the whole point. |
| | The spike strips is a great idea; Please make sure that is a "quite" mechanism not something that clings and clangs each time a car passes over it. |
| | Is it possible to preserve - make use of the girl scouts Bldg for educational purposes without over using the park? Visual presentations would help. This relates to the development of park culture also. |
| | Do not make North Claremont into a private community by restricting parking. They are all public streets. |
| | If it is unsafe to lock the gates, Don't. There is no good reason to lock/ for access. Why one hour prior to closing? There are many people who can enjoy the park in one hour. I can't see the justification for this. Don't over-bureaucratize this you will destroy all that is good about the park. Composting toilets-Yes! |
| | Yes composite toilets, Kiosks-great! Closing park hours should be as close to dusk as reasonable/possible. Don't raise entry fees more than \$1. Don't raise permits, unfair compared to other parks where high fees are usually for many parks in a system. Congestion parking of \$10 is discriminatory, way too high for modest amenities. |
| | Information kiosks are a yes and more toilets. Also, love the design for toilets. |
| | Spike strip seems unnecessary and feels very hostile. Turnstile might help with staffing issues but seems like it's a long way from wilderness. |
| | I can easily complete the whole loop in less than 45 minutes. It is not fair to not allow me to enter when I can get out before closing. Also, many just want to walk up for 20-30 minutes and return. Why are we disallowing them this opportunity to exercise (and pay parking fees?) |
| | Gate should not be locked until 1/2 hour before closes. Many people, like me, like to walk in the evening and 1 hour closing is too soon. |
| | Like the idea of the composting toilets. Support information kiosks, but I have the struggle to understand current signage, particularly parking and hours? Don't like the idea of turnstile or spike strip. Feeds like cattle. |
| | Bear proof trash cans are essential! Composting toilets are a good idea. |
| | Not a fan of the spike strip, it seems aggressive for such a passive space. My concern with the turnstile relates to malfunction. If it inadvertently locks during open hours, do residents call the City or police to get in the park? |
| | I agree with all the points. |
| | Glad for compositing toilets. Also, moving Kiosks. |
| | Turnstiles could incorporate artistic or architecturally interest elements rather than simply being utilitarian. The parking lot could have public art installation. It would be nice to use the removed compost on site or in the City somewhere (e.g., for newly planted City trees.) |
| | I like turnstile. |
| | Forget spike strips & locking gates and turnstile - absurd in wilderness area. Definitely yes for composite toilets, much safer environmentally and much better aesthetically. |
| Name & Future Acquisition Park Hours & Closures | I oppose changing the name of the Claremont Wilderness Park to Claremont Wilderness Area. The name change is misleading and inappropriate and spending \$10,000 to move in this misguided direction is a waste of money, money that could be used much more effectively implementing other parts of the Master Plan. |

CHWP Master Plan 9-28-15 Community Meeting Comment Cards Summary

| | |
|--|--|
| | 1) It is a waste of \$ to change the name. 2) It accomplishes nothing. 3) Wilderness area is federally designated status & cannot be proclaimed or adopted at will. This is a ridiculous position to take. |
| | Leave it a "Park" for perpetually! |
| | I strongly oppose changing the name to "Claremont Hills Wilderness Area". It is clear that the area does not meet the criteria of a "wilderness area". |
| | The Master proposed changing the name to "Claremont Hills Wilderness Area." We oppose (it is part of Claremont Park system, doesn't meet criteria of 'Wilderness Area'; waste of \$10k) |
| | Accept additional land into the park but not with Claremont- Provided funding (i.e. no more bonds) - Donations or foundations or land trust. Particular Palmer Canyon. I support red flag closures. |
| | I feel more strongly about this issue than any other. Minimally, hours should be extended to correspond with civil twilight (approx 30 minutes after sunset/before sunrise). Locking the gate prior to closing time is a terrible idea. A short evening walk to watch the sun set is the best thing about the park. However there is only one good reason to limit park hours at all: FIRE. Every other city park is open until 10 and neighbors have to put up with parking noise and park activities until then. In CHWP people park and vanish into solitude. Concerns about rescuing lost hikers and dangerous animals are red herrings. The only valid concern is so that people don't hang out late and have fires or smoke. A straight 9 or 10 pm closing time, enforcing strictly, would solve this. A few groups of people traveling together with a flashlight to watch moon rise is not going to be a danger. |
| | The name change is silly, this is not a wilderness. You can be Polly Anna all you want, but this is not a wilderness. |
| | TCT hours should remain 6am-10pm If no increased crime or injury at night that does not close at night. Need statistics to back up reasoning for limiting evening/morning hours. Silly to change the name |
| | The park's state purposes are not compatible with calling it a wilderness area! - The name should stay as It is. |
| | 1) Name change to "Wilderness Area" could be confusing, and could conflict with the federal definition of a 'wilderness area' 2) Plan should specify whose "red flag" warning are being referenced; i.e.. The name of the issuing organization. |
| | TCT hours should remain 6am-10pm Different trail type than CHWP. |
| | Why must this park be funded differently from other city parks? Develop a strong governance plan that is not beholden to a few wealthy families. Incorporate evidence based decision making or an ongoing bases - What happens today may be very different a year from now. As access opens elsewhere, demand here may change/decline. The city needs a plan that is flexible & based on evidence, not self interest. |
| | I support adding 1/2 hour to closing time in March & October to more closely approximate dusk. In addition, I would like to see some extension of regular hours for special events - maybe Ranger-Led moonlight hikes on full moon nights (safe, plenty of light) - or Sunrise/Sunset events. It would have been wonderful to have an "Eclipse" even last week. 1) No "Wilderness Area" denotes special features; CHWP doesn't meet criteria 2) is part of Claremont city parks 3) Cost = \$10k/benefit = 0 |
| | Agree e plan to extend/modify Oct & March hours. Makes sense to include new land acquisitions. |
| | CHWP is many acres and extends into the foothills, so it needs the shorter hours that are now maintained. The Thompson Creek Trail is a short walking trail. I think the 6am to 10pm are appropriate for this trail. |
| | Oppose renaming of Wilderness Park to Wilderness Area. In 5.2.5 a statement suggests the term "Park" may connote conditions contrary to natural open space areas. Should the "National Park System" areas be renamed? More locally, should Sycamore Canyon Park also be renamed to be consistent? You do not suggest that change. \$10,000 can be better used for environmental preservation or increased environmental stewardship. \$10,000 could support exiting educational programs to increase awareness and stewardship. |
| | No need to change the name save \$10,000. Spend \$10,000 on more toilets. |
| | Need to keep park open longer so I can have an opportunity to walk after work and I do not have a 9-5 job! |
| | Don't waste money to change the name. |
| | Do not support name change. Not a good use of money. |
| | "Wilderness Area" may have Federal definition that is inconsistent with the Claremont Park. |
| | I support adding 1/2 hour to park hours in March-October or so to accommodate visitors. I hope fees will not be increased. Re: Parking as they may become barriers to use by those who need the park the most. I oppose congestion fees as well. Lets work toward more overflow parking options for heavy use hours and days. |
| | Set up permits to be in the park after hours to watch the sunset or moonrise. Don't close gates 1 hour before. Not everyone does the full loop. Lock 1/2 hour before closing. |
| | I would like the Sept & Oct months' park hours to open at 6 am in order to walk before it get too hot. I average about 2 hours to complete the loop, and DUE TO MY AGE and medications I must avoid the sun as much as possible. Please keep the 5:30am hours, and we do not want to change the park name at any cost price. |
| | It really doesn't qualify as a "Wilderness" Better to keep it within the park system. |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>1) I spoke to my friend Lisa who said she felt its important re parking fees to have them low enough so everyone can use the park - all socioeconomic gps, retired people etc.</p> <p>2) Funding needs to be a commitment by the city as part of its parks program. Parking will bring revenues but there are limits to that & if parking is the only source of funds, the temptation will be to overprice the program. This will have negative results.</p> <p>3)I think we should expand the hillsides area. It will be even more valuable to have natural areas as time goes by. This investment has already proven demand & need. If we work with our neighbors, more of these natural areas will be accessible, spreading the wealth- and spreading demand, one would hope. It must be thoughtfully done. Unfettered growth & urban development has shown its limitations in Los Angeles and other major urban areas. We must hold on to our wild areas to create a place for balance in our lives.</p> <p>4) I strongly oppose congestion fee and increasing 4 hour fees. Current fees are at market price. It is tempting to price by supply and demand, but the park should be affordable and parking not priced at luxury prices just because it is so popular. People outside of Claremont recognize its value and quality which speaks to Claremont's value. Being good hosts means we find means to be welcoming. A shuttle from the metro link parking lot on 1st street would be one alternative solution. Planning for and creating additional parking should be a recognized need that will be always changing.</p> <p>5) I support the CWC position on hours 1) to remain open 30 min longer in March and October 2) locking gate 30 min before closing; (We tried to go to a museum in Budapest this summer that was suppose to close at 6 and at 5 they closed the doors. We only had 1 day and would have appreciated being able to see what we could in an hour. The point is to serve the public - priority should be there.</p> <p>6) Re Change name to CHW Area - "Park" designates this is part of the city and its functions. "Area" is unclear as to who is responsible & what the use is. Eg. Griffith Park is much larger than our wilderness park but in its name there is no question that it is a part of LA and its park program. "Area" is a less understood term.</p> |
| | <p>I fully support the plan recommendations regarding park hours & closures. Opening hours should not be increased!! Park opening hours should be strictly enforced!</p> |
| | <p>TCT trail is unrelated and should have different hours. Keep 6am-10pm hours. Current hours are okay, maybe look at March-October to maximize time. Not in favor of changing name. Unnecessary. People recognize park in many ways. National parks are passive and protected.</p> |
| | <p>Park hours should be increased 30 minutes in March and October. This would help correspond with the other times during the year in terms of time of dusk. These are crucial minutes for working people who have limited time to exercise outside. The neighbors' opposition should not determine the hours. 30 minutes shouldn't make that much of a difference to them. Locking the gate one hour before closing is excessive. Certainly users can use that hour for a quick run. 30 minutes before closing seems much more reasonable.</p> |
| | <p>Changing name to Wilderness area is silly.</p> |
| | <p>Allow extended hours during hot summer months for people who do not want to hike in the heat. Mistake to change the name. "Wilderness area" is not descriptive. If park is good enough for the National Park its good for Claremont. Waste of money.</p> |
| | <p>A citizens committee should be a broader view then Claremont. Bring the region into the process so that all will take responsibility. More rangers, volunteer rangers & helpers. Look at the long-term needs of the park and the users.</p> |
| | <p>Park is appropriate name. Does not need meet "Wilderness Area" Federal definition.</p> |
| | <p>Just plain silly and waste of money to change the name. People who like the park just call it The Loop</p> |
| | <p>Hours should be as close to dusk as possible. Red flag closures good. Name change - No No No! Wilderness Area in a national park is something very different from this. Bad use of \$10,000.</p> |
| | <p>The proposed name change to CHWA makes little sense. First it is costly. The \$10,000 budget for this change could be better spent on another aspect of the plan. Second: The change to the Wilderness Area is unlikely to have the stated goal - i.e. increasing visits care for the area. This is better addressed through creating a cultural of stewardship. Third: The term "Wilderness Area" has specific meaning on federally designated lands. The CHWP does not fit the criteria for the wilderness area. Hours: No need to close the gate one hour before park closes. Not everyone walks full loop. Shorter excursions would be unnecessarily curtailed by this change.</p> |
| | <p>Overall park hours work. Add 30 minutes to hours of closure in March & October to match dusk & dawn. No need to change name - doesn't seem to add anything.</p> |
| | <p>Mer? Put all areas under one umbrella and set of rules. Name changes sums experience for semantics.</p> |
| | <p>Thompson Creek Trail cannot have same hours as wilderness park as it is used by local residents for am & late pm day walking etc.</p> |
| | <p>Don't change the name.</p> |
| | <p>Increase educational component to include environmental education. Dawn to dusk to capture March/Oct hours. Special permit application for moonlight or after hour hikes. Do not need to be a ranger guided as long as people go through a screening process. Don't change the name. Won't change behavior. Focus on education. Red flag closures are good.</p> |
| | <p>How many days of closure days per year or average due to red flag?</p> |

CHWP Master Plan 9-28-15 Community Meeting Comment Cards Summary

| | |
|--|---|
| | When "Wilderness" is used before "Park" it means that major attention should be paid to the wilderness aspects of the park- The natural ecology, The watershed, the comparative unimportance of modern "civilization." Please don't change the name. |
| | No benefit to renaming the park. It is not a "Wilderness Area." Not worth the \$10,000. Support future acquisitions rolling into the park. Make hours easier and be flexible. |
| | Sometimes the sun is still up, yet the park closes and please adjust. Especially March & October. No name change necessary. |
| | No Name change. Park is more effective than area also costly to change. Plan for the future more specifically. |
| | It makes logical sense to expand the park hours during the transition months of March and October. Now the park closes a full hour before the sun sets and dusk. Even 30 minutes would be more rational. Please leave the parking lot open until 30 minutes before closing. I often walk at the end of the day in the oak groves. Closing an hour before closure closes me out! |
| | It's silly to change the name from "Park" to "area." Park is perfectly legitimate signal for a "wilderness park". Nobody expects jungle gyms therein. Really. |
| | Hours should be dawn to dusk - which means expanding closing hours by 30 minutes in March and October at least. Thompson Creek Trail does not have to have the same restricted hours - much less dangerous and much more suburban atmosphere. If you lock gates do so 1/2 an hour before closing not an hour. |
| | Park name change proposal is a huge waste of money - No. Yes, for acquisition into CHWP for uniform policies and implementation of plan in all Wilderness Areas. Yes, - support initiative to expand wilderness holdings and to explore many sources of funding for future actuations. |
| | Not much in the world that requires upkeep and maintained is truly free, and therefore fees are understandable. Rather than have parking fees (does a parking lot require as much up keep as the park itself?), however, I'd advocate an admission into the park, including the option of an annual fee for both individuals and families .The Botanical Gardens opted for this plan, and it has worked out well. I advocate this plan if it's possible to expand the parking area. That way, complaints form homeowners close to the park may subside. If it is feasible, I think this idea should at least be tried to see if it solves the parking and complaints issues. The Park should be open dawn to dusk, whatever the season, even if it means changing the currents hours. |
| | I see no reason to rush into changing the name of the park. "Park" sounds more people and family friendly. National parks that are even much wilder than ours are still called "park"!(Yosemite National Wilderness Area???) Let's not exaggerate what the park is: it's still part of our city park system. |
| | I am opposed to changing the name. I'm in favor of future land acquisitions. Park hours - should add 30 minutes to dusk closure for March & October. Please lock the gate 30 minutes before, not one hour, before closing time. |
| | 1) Please add hours in March & October to better fit with dawn & dusk. 2) Why regulate Thompson Creek Path? It is entirely different than the WP - it backs residential areas & is used by peds & dog walkers @all times of the day. Closing it is extreme, unnecessary & exemplifies Over regulation. |
| | This park is reason I moved back to Claremont a few years ago. It is a tremendous asset to this and surrounding communities. Strong, progressive leadership is needed to manage this resource wisely. The city needs to reset the few loud voices of selfish property owners who take the value provided by the open space but want to limit it to themselves. The city should look to the lessons learned by other communities who have found solid, fair solutions to this problem. The city should engage Rancho, La Verne, Upland, and other foothill communities to open access and manage demand. |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>1) I am against changing the name to "Claremont Hills Wilderness Area." The projected cost of \$10,00 to make this change would be a waste of money, which could be better used in other areas of the Park's management and maintenance. Further, this is not a Wilderness area as the term is commonly understood and defined. 2) I advocate for a wilderness park where we can feel free to watch the sunset from a ridge top looking out over the LA basin and perhaps even see the moonrise to the east without being worried we will be locked in or given a ticket. In order to allow this, I propose the park closing hours be increased as follows: Nov-Jan: 6pm, Feb: 6:30pm, Mar: 7:30pm, Apr-Sept: increase closing time by half an hour over what is posted, Oct: 7:30pm. This extra time will allow working folks to take a quick hike or bike ride after work, make it easier for people to see the spectacular sunsets from the top of one of the ridges, and will not adversely affect conditions in the surrounding neighborhoods. 3) Additionally, there should be a permit system whereby you can get special permission to stay in the park into night. This would allow for full-moon hikes as well as night-time mountain bike rides during the hot weather of summer or, after work during the short days of winter. Eligibility for permits could be based on purpose of visit as well as the applicant's ability to meet certain safety criteria set by the city. 4) I am against locking the entrance gate 1 hour before closing. This is based on the idea that it takes more than an hour to walk around the loop. That may be true, but many visitors, including myself, do not always walk the entire loop. I deserve a right to drive up to the park after work and take a 30 minute stroll or bike ride in and back out. 5) I do not support raising the parking fees. This will drive away visitors as well as drive more people to park in adjacent neighborhoods. 6) I do not support the \$10 congestion parking fee for Sat and Sun mornings. It would be better to provide adequate overflow parking or even ease parking restrictions on adjacent streets during those short periods of time. Another potential solution would be a shuttle service. (See section on parking below).</p> <p>Parking: Proposal for a Shuttle System As a way to solve the parking issues, especially on Sunday and Saturday mornings, I want to advocate for parking in the village area with a City-run shuttle service to the park. This simple idea will pay dividends in terms of relieving the pressure in the lots at the top of Mills and in terms of local restaurants and businesses, where many visitors will want to eat or shop either before or after their hikes. There might even be a way to encourage this by offering discounts at local eateries upon proof of using the Wilderness Park Shuttle system.</p> |
| | <p>I am a homeowner who lives on Holyoke Pl. I am not able to attend the community meeting tonight, but I would like to express my continued support for residential parking permits. Since the permit parking was put into place, there has not been any more trash in my front yard, nor have there been anymore broken sprinklers. More importantly, it is now much safer to turn from Holyoke onto Mills. Since there are no longer so many cars parked on the street it is much easier to see. There are no longer pedestrians walking in the street nor are there cyclists biking the wrong way. All of these changes are a result of the permit parking, so I am in support of continuing the permits.</p> |
| | <p>This is not wilderness. "Natural" might be better. Ex. The Claremont Natural Area.</p> |
| | <p>Work on what will be the official responsible governing of the park. A citizens committee should be a broader view than Claremont, because the region into the propose so that all will take responsibility. More park rangers, volunteer rangers and helpers. Look at the long-term needs of the park and the users.</p> |
| | <p>Yes put all areas under one umbrella and set of rules. Name changes seems unnecessary for semantics.</p> |
| | <p>This park is the reason I moved to Claremont a few years ago. It is a tremendous asset to this and surrounding communities, Strong, progressive leadership is needed to manage this resource wisely. The City needs to asset the few loud voices of selfish property owners who take the value provided by the open space but want to omit it to themselves, The City should look to the lessons learned by others communities who have found solid, fair solutions to this problem. The City should engage Rancho, La Verne, Upland, and other foothill communities to open access and manage demand.</p> |
| | <p>Re: Park Name Changes to Claremont Hills Wilderness Area: The park's stated purposes are not compatible with calling it a Wilderness Area! - The name should stay as is!</p> |

I support all these changes:

"CLIFF Notes" of CWC response to draft MasterPlan (9/25/15)

CWC has worked with the City throughout the planning process, and we agree with many of the points included in the draft Master Plan (MP). However, we have identified several issues that we feel need strengthening, and others where we oppose specific recommendations in the Plan.

The Community meeting on Monday evening (**Sept 28, 6-9 PM, Taylor Hall**) will be organized by topic tables. Here are a brief guide to the main messages we want to convey, organized by table topics. You can write comments on notecards (either during or before the meeting) or make oral comments that will be recorded by staff at the tables. If you wish greater understanding of our positions, the full document is posted at www.claremontwildlands.org.

Table: Background, Purpose, Resource Management Plan:

*CHWP is an asset; **stress positive aspects** of visitors (no significant damage to park; parking fees help support park costs; create future advocates for preservation of open space; bring potential customers for Claremont business)

*CWC urges stronger, broader **vision** to guide management and decision making for 20+ years

*Need stronger commitment to **expansion** of park across all of Claremont's hillsides; coordination with neighboring communities to contribute to larger continuous regional open space

Table: Management, Operations, Maintenance (Funding)

*The Master Plan states that CHWP (unlike all other city parks) must be financially self-supporting for next 20+ years. While primary **funding** may come from parking fees, we should not tie the hands of future City Councils.

*CWC supports adding a **governance plan** -- a well-defined organizational structure for CHWP management and decision-making with an advisory committee made up of various stakeholders to monitor implementation of the plan and insure public input

*Up-to-date **empirical data** are necessary to inform decision making

Table: Open Space:

*The Master Plan proposes **changing the name** to "Claremont Hills Wilderness Area". We oppose (it is part of the Claremont Park system, doesn't meet criteria of 'Wilderness Area'; waste of \$10K)

Table: Parking Lots:

*The Master Plan recommends maintaining current **park hours**. CWC proposes adding 30 minutes to the park's open hours in March and October to match dusk; results in additional 30 hours of visitor use per year

*The Plan would **lock the entrance gate** 1 hour before closing time; we propose only 30 minutes

*The Master Plan raises 4-hour daily **parking fee from \$3 to \$5** and **annual fee from \$100 to \$140**; CWC proposes leaving these fees at the current levels which are more in line with comparable parks. The proposed increases may have negative consequences (drive people away resulting in decreased revenues; provide incentive or visitors to park on streets, thus having negative impact on neighbors)

*It also proposes a **\$10 congestion parking fee** during peak periods (Sat. and Sun. mornings) when the current lots are full. CWC strongly opposes, as we feel it is discriminatory and likely to have unintended negative consequences as above. A better solution is to provide adequate overflow parking in spaces adjacent to the current lots.