

Comments on the  
May 26, 2026 Draft Update to the Fiscalini Ranch Public Access & Resource Management Plan

I'm offering the following comments for consideration by the ad hoc committee for revisions to the May 26, 2026 Draft Update to the Fiscalini Ranch Public Access & Resource Management Plan, which I may refer to for brevity as the Ranch Management Plan. I would like to start by offering my appreciation to the ad hoc committee. Vice President Dean and Director Scott have made substantial process progress improving the relationship between CCSD and FFRP, and clarifying the respective roles and responsibilities of CCSD and the FFRP. The amended plan, once revised, will be invaluable as CCSD and FFRP continue working in partnership to preserve our gem of the Central Coast in perpetuity.

Also, recognizing the effort involved in amending the Ranch Management Plan, more than 23 years since the original plan was published, this is a rare once in a generation opportunity to get it right. These comments are offered in the spirit of service to the Cambria community to do just that.

\*\*\*\*\*

**One overarching comment that applies to the entire document:**

One of the reformatting actions has been to remove all of the numbering from the original Ranch Management Plan. The numbering of sections made it easy to know where the section breaks were. Removal of all numbering reduces clarity of the plan and makes reading more difficult. This is obviously not a showstopper, but why would we deliver a an update that reduces the usability?

\*\*\*\*\*

**Chapter 1. Executive Summary, page 5-11**

On page 5, Purpose of the Update, the statement:

Since the plan's adoption, ***the District's role has shifted significantly** toward providing core life-safety and essential public services, including fire protection, water supply, wastewater treatment, and emergency response.*

is not quite true. The District's role has not changed at all. The roles remain the same, and fire protection, water supply, waste water treatment, and emergency response have always been higher priorities. It would be more accurate to say that:

*the District is establishing more fiscal discipline to ensure the integrity of the General Fund.*

Under **Critical Funding Constraints**, the second sentence,

*However, this fund is primarily supported by limited property tax allocations and is further constrained by rising costs for **fire**, facilities, and emergency services.*

Probably better conveys your intent if you add the word protection:

*However, this fund is primarily supported by limited property tax allocations and is further constrained by rising costs for **fire protection**, facilities, and emergency services.*

Comments on the

May 26, 2026 Draft Update to the Fiscalini Ranch Public Access & Resource Management Plan

Under **CCSD Financial Capacity Policy**, the second sentence,

*Because the CCSD must prioritize essential public safety, **water supply, wastewater treatment**, and emergency response obligations,*

inaccurately infers that funding for the Ranch competes with funding for water supply and wastewater treatment. This is a false inference. Stick to the general fund issues. If we delete “*water supply and wastewater treatment*” the sentence and inference will be accurate.

**Agency Coordination and Jurisdiction:**

On page 8, **CalTrans**, I'm curious about reference to the **pedestrian bridge at the Highway 1 bridge**. This infers that there is bridge, when in fact there is not. I recognize that this is the same wording as in the 4/24/2003 plan. Unless you're aware of a bridge that I haven't seen, probably best to delete this reference.

Interesting that **this Amendment adds the Conservation Easement** in this section, as the Conservation Easement is not an agency.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Chapter 2. Background**, page 11-17

On page 12, A minor change under **Setting** reduces the accuracy of the document.

- Formerly, the text reads: *Windsor Boulevard, which runs to the north and south of the West Ranch...*
- Now the text reads: *Windsor Boulevard, which runs north-south through West Ranch*, incorrectly inferring continuity of Windsor Drive through the Ranch, which is not correct.
- Certainly more accurate to restore the original wording.

On page 13–14, under **Key Objectives**:

3 highlighted objectives have been added, which seem consistent and reasonable.

2 of the 3 objectives that have been deleted seem to be important objectives which should be restored. This is not a show stopper, but worth consideration.

- *Identify a suitable area for an active Community Park on the East Ranch.*
- *Provide guidance on implementation activities...*

**Infrastructure, Utilities & Public Services:**

- On page 15, *The CCSD provides water supply and wastewater treatment, fire protection, trash service, and streetlights.* Aren't you forgetting something? Check the Mission Statement. *The CCSD provides water, wastewater, fire protection and emergency services, **parks, recreation, and open space**...*

- On pages 15-16, under On-site Access/Trails, The last sentence reads, *This is discussed further in the chapter*. Is it? I don't see where.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **Chapter 3. Uses & Improvements**, page 18-21

Under **Prohibited Uses**, on page 19:

- In the 4<sup>th</sup> bullet, *Motorized Vehicles... Except for those vehicles allowed... As described in section A*, the section numbering and lettering have been removed, so this is a hanging reference. This is pretty minor, but still...

Under **Physical Improvements**, on page 20,

- *Restrooms are only allowed at the Community Park on the East Ranch.*
- The original plan states: *Restrooms are allowed at the Community Park on the East Ranch.*
- This is a significant change. Are we sure we want to memorialize this absolute limitation?

\*\*\*\*\*

### **Chapter 4. Public Access and Recreation**, page 21-32

Under Trail Linkages and Access Points, on page 22, why was reference to the **Cross Town Trail** eliminated? This trail, from Shamel Park to Cambria Drive, is easily as significant as other trail linkages in the section. This **Cross Town Trail** is also later referenced on pages 25 and 29.

Under **Major Trail Segments**,

**Ridge Trail**, on page 24, the statement: *A locked gate should be installed*, should be replaced with the statement: *A locked gate for vehicle access has been installed at the trail entrance on Huntington Road*, consistent with the revision just above under Marine Terrace Trail.

**Santa Rosa Creek-West, Description**, On page 25:

The sentence that reads: *This new trail should follow the existing sewer easement alignment and maintenance road...*

Should be replaced with: *This new trail follows the existing sewer easement alignment and maintenance road...*

**Santa Rosa Creek-East Description**, on pages 25-26:

The sentence that reads: *This new trail should generally follow the utility easement...*

Should be replaced with: *This new trail generally follows the utility easement...*

Comments on the

May 26, 2026 Draft Update to the Fiscalini Ranch Public Access & Resource Management Plan  
Wallbridge to Ridge Trail Description, on page 26:

This trail does not switchback up the western slope from Wallbridge to the Ridge Trail as stated.

This trail switchbacks up the western slope from Wallbridge to the Dolphin Trail.

**Huntington Entrance**, on page 28, the statement: the gate at the Ranch entrance should be replaced with a *locked gate*, should be replaced with the statement: *A locked gate for vehicle access has been installed.*

**Local County Parks**, pages 28–29, *The Facilities & Resources Manager should try to coordinate parking at nearby County parks, especially Lampton Park and Shamel Park. Seriously?*

**Gate Types, Emergency & Maintenance Access Gates**, on page 32:

**Huntington** – the statement: *The existing gate should be replaced with a locking gate for emergency access and restoration work.* should be replaced with: *a locking gate for emergency access and restoration work.* Delete *The existing gate should be replaced with.*

I highlighted several other inaccuracies that have limited impact, along with section headers.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Chapter 5. Natural Resource Restoration and Protection**, page 32-42

On page 34, under **Seasonal Wetland**, in the first paragraph, the sentence that originally reads: *Most of these wetlands are disturbed from grazing.*

has been changed to. *Most of these wetlands are disturbed by grazing.*

Although this is a small change, the revised wording is less accurate, inferring that grazing is continuing in these wetlands areas. The original wording is more accurate and should be restored.

On page 41, under **West Ranch “SeaClift” Gully**, The original Ranch Plan Management plan identified 2 alternatives recommended by the RCD. The first part of the amended paragraph provides an accurate description of what work was actually performed by the RCD, but the second-half of the paragraph needs to be deleted, as it refers to the 2 alternatives presented in the original plan. Delete the section that reads: *Both methods propose mechanical intervention. Care must be taken during construction to avoid adjacent wetlands; wetlands should be fenced off during construction. In both alternatives, the drainage culvert under Windsor Boulevard will require upgrading with engineering and construction by the County Engineering Department, as it is not located on the Ranch property.*

\*\*\*\*\*

**Chapter 7. Vegetation Management**, pages 43-46

On page 43, delete the 2<sup>nd</sup> CCSD, where the original plan had Ranch Manager

- Minimize liability and cost to CCSD / CCSD

Near the top of page 46/112, The sentence that reads

*Annual evaluations that measure the progress of the vegetation management program against objectives. The review is intended to inform the CCSD of the effectiveness of its operations and to determine if modifications to the Program are necessary to improve the achievement of its goals.*

Should actually be the third bullet under **The monitoring plan should include the following components:**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Chapter 9. Implementation**, pages 49–55.

Page 49: *The management team ideally should be composed of the following coordinators...*

The updated plan, essentially identical to the original plan, still has no clarity regarding which organization is responsible for staffing these roles, except the last sentence under **Public Outreach Coordinator**: *Upon FFRP selecting one or more coordinators, their names and contact information should be provided to the CCSD.* Given the placing of the sentence, it appears that this only applies to the Public Outreach Coordinator, however, I believe the intent is that the sentence applies to all of the above coordinators. If that’s the case, this should be moved to the paragraph above the list of coordinators.