

## Appendix G: Summary of Public Scoping Comments, 2000

The Fort Hunter Liggett Special Resource Study process included a public comment period in August and September, 2000. The following section summarizes the issues and ideas that were contributed at public meetings and through letters and e-mail during that time.

### Study area boundary

- The NPS study should be limited to the buildings and associated land declared excess by the Army
- The NPS study should examine the resources of the entire 165,000 acres of Fort Hunter Liggett

### Army training mission

- There must be no negative effects on training operations
- What impacts would there be on National Guard training from Camp Roberts, or future expansion of training activities?

### Visitor access

- Protect cultural resources from impacts associated with increased visitor access. There should be no access to sensitive cultural resources unless protection is guaranteed
- Provide access for elderly visitors
- Consider extending the same access privileges as those currently enjoyed by hunters and fishermen to other groups such as wildlife photographers, botanists, artists, and naturalists
- Increased access would necessitate safety measures for existing housing areas
- Cleanup up of hazardous materials and unexploded ordnance would be required
- Determine visitor carrying capacity
- Current access is limited by the Army
- Consider restoration of access through Fort Hunter Liggett along Sulfur Springs Road

### Hunting and fishing interests

- Army already has partnerships with various hunting/fishing agencies and organizations
- Hunting interests wish to retain access through Los Padres National Forest
- The Army will continue to manage the hunting and fishing permits

### Protection of resource values

- Much of the area between Mission San Antonio and the National Forest is oak savanna habitat, a valuable and diminishing California wildlife resource
- Long-term preservation of resources is important
- Fort Hunter Liggett is a valuable resource for researchers and scientists
- NPS should manage buildings on Jolon Road - Tidball Store, Dutton Hotel, etc.
- Jolon is a true ghost town; there is potential for re-creation of Dutton Hotel, the Dance Hall, the school, and Garcia's saloon
- The upper San Antonio River area, specifically the area of the Mission aqueduct, should be a focus of the study. The condition of the Mission aqueduct system should be assessed and interpreted
- Continued protection of archaeological sites and other cultural resources is critical - they are not a "renewable resource"
- Cultural sites are currently protected by limited access
- Information about cultural site locations must be kept secure
- The Fort Hunter Liggett Historic Preservation Plan is working - sacred sites must not be open to the public
- Concessioners should maintain scenic and cultural integrity of Hacienda and other properties
- Need to educate public about traditional uses of Fort Hunter Liggett (hunting, etc.)
- Overlapping eras of history; preservation of "Old California" versus commercialization
- The Salinan Nation will exhibit artifacts at the Tidball Store
- The whole of cultural sites is greater than the sum of the parts

### Desired future conditions

- Another retail facility like the Jolon General Store is needed
- The Fire Academy can continue to use facilities
- There is high demand for Hacienda rooms, food, and souvenirs - should advertise their availability
- Housing opportunities for USFS employees are needed
- Lease excess facilities back to the Army
- Hacienda could be a stop on regional wine tour
- There is interpretive potential with the Hacienda connection to Hearst Castle

- Opportunities for schools to study history
- Roadside turnouts or wayside interpretation
- Removal of visually intrusive buildings, such as the tin barn fire station and some of the motel-style housing units; no additional buildings should be built
- Continue opportunity for hunting and fishing
- Hiking trails to connect to Los Padres National Forest
- Rehabilitate damaged lands
- Concern about drug rehabilitation and homeless shelter use of excess facilities if NPS does not take them

#### **Mechanisms for protection**

- A new model of public use of military land is needed
- Involve local people in decision making
- Partnerships with California Department of Fish and Game and US Fish and Wildlife Service are in place
- USFS has interest in former USFS lands that were transferred to Fort Hunter Liggett, if determined excess in future by the Army
- Potential for California State Parks and Recreation operation of Hacienda
- Coordination with Monterey County's proposed San Antonio Historic District Plan
- Continuation of Salinan Nation lease on the Tidball Store
- National Historic Landmark nomination of additional sites/district should be re-addressed

#### **Management issues**

- The Army has done a good job protecting resources at Fort Hunter Liggett
- What types of management possibilities will be considered in the study?
- What would "cooperative management" mean?
- What potential value would be added by a NPS presence on the base?
- Will there be any changes to the Hacienda or limitations on use? Will there be a "tie-in" with San Simeon Hearst Castle?
- Future use and management of Hacienda will require financial backing for restoration and repairs
- There are access limitations to Hacienda under the current concessionaire operation
- Future concessionaires
- Infrastructure investment is needed at Tidball Store

- Continued maintenance of excess housing
- Safety: law enforcement staff needed to support increased visitor use
- Firearms control vs. hunting activities
- Investment requirements for excess property - is this a "turn-key" operation?
- There is unexploded ordnance on the post, and there may be other hazardous materials. What are the potential clean-up costs, and who would be responsible for this?
- Will NPS operate the excess facilities?
- Who would use the excess housing and who would determine who stays there?
- Prescribed burns are effective for fire management
- Eradication program is needed for yellow starthistle
- Website for training, visitor, hunting and fishing coordination

#### **Potential impacts**

- Impacts on the local economy
- Does the NPS study include road networks and the associated pollution and congestion?
- Impacts of park designation on regional infrastructure, such as increased costs of road maintenance associated with increased visitor use
- Impacts of increased visitation on Mission San Antonio de Padua

#### **Similarities to management of other areas**

- Avoid boarding up excess buildings as at Fort Ord
- Comparison to Presidio closure: do not evict existing occupants
- Compare to other parks with historic structures and lodging
- Removal of unneeded buildings

#### **Issues expressed but not within the scope of this study**

- Access to The Indians via Arroyo Seco Road
- Monterey County has special use permits for Arroyo Seco access route
- Reconstruction of San Lucas/Lockwood Road
- Road access from Bryson to connect with road to San Simeon estate
- Road to Jolon is too steep

## Appendix H: Summary of Comments on Draft Study Report and NPS Responses

The study team reviewed all e-mails, letters, faxes, and other comments submitted during the public comment period for the draft Fort Hunter Liggett Special Resource Study and Environmental Assessment. All comments were treated equally. The analytical process made no attempt to treat comments as votes, nor did it attempt to sway decision-makers towards the will of any majority. Emphasis was on the content of the comment rather than the number of people who agreed with it. This type of content analysis ensures that every comment is considered in the decision process. Similar comments were grouped for response.

The comment analysis and response section of this report is divided into topics that primarily relate to sections in the draft study. This includes study process, resource description, significance, suitability, feasibility, alternatives and environmental assessment. Subtopics on more specific concerns represent common themes identified from the comments.

### STUDY PROCESS

**Comment: Salinan groups were not involved in the plans proposed in the draft document.**

#### Comments included:

- The Salinan Tribe was not notified or consulted on the plan to turn over any tribal historical land to any entity besides them.
- The Salinan Tribe of Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties has not been contacted in the last three years.
- The Salinan Tribe of Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties attempted to rectify this problem by contacting and meeting with representatives of Fort Hunter Liggett. They find the data in the report to be inadequate; they should be part of any decision concerning their ancestral homeland.
- The Xolon Salinan Tribe has petitioned for federal recognition. List the Xolon Salinan group among Native American participants regarding their aboriginal territory.

**Response:** Since NPS initiated the study in 2000, there have been changes to organizations representing Salinans. The NPS was in contact with the Salinan Nation and was unaware of the newly formed Salinan Tribe of Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties. On request, the NPS met with the Salinan Tribe of Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties during the public comment period for the draft study. The NPS has revised the draft study to acknowledge that there are three organizations that represent Salinan interests: Xolon Salinan Tribe, Salinan Tribe of Monterey and San Luis Obispo Counties; and the Salinan Nation Cultural Preservation Association.

### RESOURCE DESCRIPTION, SIGNIFICANCE, AND SUITABILITY

#### Natural Resources

**Comment: *Delphinium gypsophyllum* subsp. *parviflorum* and *Calystegia collina* subsp. *venusta* (South Coast Range morning glory) are two taxa on Tables 4 and 5 that have now been verified as belonging to other taxa. All specimens previously referred and *Calystegia collina* subsp. *venusta* (South Coast Range morning glory) from Fort Hunter Liggett have been verified as belonging to *Calystegia collina* subsp. *collina*. These are the first known collections of *Calystegia collina* subsp. *collina* from anywhere south of the Bay Area.**

**Response:** These plant taxa have been removed from the respective tables in the draft study report.

**Comment: The single occurrence of *Calyptridium parryi* var. *hesseae* (Santa Cruz Mountains pussypaws) is one of only two known occurrences in the Santa Lucia Mountains.**

**Response:** This information has been included in the description of natural resource significance.

**Comment: The draft report is missing an assessment of population size and number for plant species that are of conservation concern and are globally rarer than listed species such as purple amole and Santa Lucia mint.**

San Simeon baccharis (*Baccharis plummerae* subsp. *glabrata*) – the population in Los Burros gorge is the only known population on “public” lands; the only other populations in the world are restricted to a small area on private, grazed land in Monterey County.

San Antonio collinsia (*Collinsia antonina*) – Three of only four verified populations of San Antonio collinsia occur on Fort Hunter Liggett. This taxon has recently been added to CNPS list 1B.

Yellow-flowered eriastrum (*Eriastrum luteum*) – Three of the only known extant populations in San Luis Obispo and Monterey counties occur on the installation. This rare species has not been reported recently from other historic localities.

Caper-fruited tropidocarpum (*Tropidocarpum capparideum*) – *Tropidocarpum capparideum*, which had been thought to be extirpated, was discovered on FHL in 2000. The only known extant populations occur on the installation; all other, previously documented populations elsewhere in California are believed to be extirpated. The FHL populations remain the only extant populations known.

**Response:** NPS has included these species in the description of natural resource significance.

**Comment:** Although several species occur more widely elsewhere, it is important to note that the population of *Syntrichopappus lemmonii* (Lemmon's syntrichopappus) is the only one documented in the California Coast Ranges.

**Response:** NPS has included this information in the description of natural resource significance.

**Comment:** Future surveys and monitoring will show that additional species listed in Table 5 may be best represented by viable populations on Fort Hunter Liggett, including for example, *Navarretia prostrate* (prostrate navarretia) and *Calycadenia villosa* (dwarf calcydonia). Most of the known (>80%), extant (and largest) populations of the latter species have been documented from the installation.

**Response:** NPS has revised the natural resource significance and suitability sections of the report to acknowledge the need for surveys and monitoring.

**Comment:** Several species of concern documented at FHL are not mentioned in the draft document, including:

- *Navarretia nigelliformis* subsp. *Radicans* (shining Navarretia)
- *Pentachaeta exilis* subsp. *Aeolica* (slender Pentachaeta). This species is notable in that one of only four known populations has been documented from Fort Hunter Liggett.
- *Quercus parvula* var. *shrevei* (Shreve's oak). The only known population east of the coastal slopes of the Santa Lucia Mountains has been documented from San Miguel Creek in Training Area 11 on Fort Hunter Liggett. Shreve's oak is much less common than many other listed oak species.

**Response:** Information on the rarity of these species has been added to the description of natural resource significance and the table "Other Special Interest Plant Species Documented on Fort Hunter Liggett."

**Comment:** Many of the rare taxa are concentrated in several areas of the installation. Among them are the extensive outcrops of ultramafic substrates, especially on Burro Mountain, and the Los Burro Creek and Little Los Burros Creek drainages. At least 16 species listed in Tables 4-5 occur there. The Los Bueyes and Los Burro Creek drainages are also significant, because nearly all of the known populations of *Pogogyne clareana* (Santa Lucia mint) and *Horkelia yadonii* (Santa Lucia horkelia) occur there, in addition to the only known

populations of *Calyptridium parryi* var. *hesseae* (Santa Cruz Mountains pussypaws) and *Pentachaeta exilis* subsp. *Aeolica* (slender Pentachaeta).

**Response:** Information on the rarity of these species has been added to the description of natural resource significance.

**Comment:** Few systematic searches of the installation have been conducted at FHL specifically dedicated to finding unrecorded populations of special interest taxa known to occur there or to search of taxa not yet documented.

- Three sensitive plant taxa were surveyed in 2000. This leaves a need for intensive surveys of over 65 other special interest taxa known to occur on the installation.
- Areas that have not been extensively surveyed include the drainages of San Miguel, Anthony, and North Fork creeks. These areas may harbor populations of interest. These areas have not experienced intensive use for military training.
- In recent years the California Native Plant Society has had increasing difficulty in getting into the back country areas which have seen little or no military activity to check on the status of many of the plants that we first identified.

**Response:** The suitability analysis has been revised to include the potential for scientific study of these areas, and a recommendation has been added in the "Management Options and Opportunities" section to encourage the Army to coordinate with scientists from universities and non-profit organizations to continue to inventory natural resources and conduct scientific research, including botanical surveys.

**Comment:** The Monterey Chapter of the California Native Plant Society has been trying for 17 years to get the USFS to designate a Research Natural Area (RNA) for valley oak savanna at Wagon Caves (approved in the Forest Plan in 1987) in the area adjoining FHL on the north. There is a potential here for a larger RNA protecting the best remaining relatively pristine habitat of this type.

**Response:** The suitability analysis has been revised to include the potential for scientific study of these areas, and a recommendation has been added in the "Management Options and Opportunities" section to encourage the Army to manage the valley oak savanna in collaboration with the USFS.

**Comment:** Figure 11 indicates that much of the Ammunition Supply Point (ASP) was cultivated but does not document this claim. The supposedly cultivated part of the ASP includes vernal pools

**and upland areas with documented populations of sensitive taxa. There needs to be documentation provided as to the sources used to construct the map.**

**Response:** Comment noted. At the landscape scale of mapping land-cover, it is not possible to include all vegetation and habitat features. This information is meant to give a large overview of habitat types at Fort Hunter Liggett. The source for the vegetation coverage used in Figure 11: Habitat Types is the California Gap Analysis Land-Cover/Vegetation Layer. This GIS layer was derived from photo interpretation of 1990 Landsat Thematic Mapper digital images, supplemented by aerial photography, large scale vegetation maps, survey maps, and field visits. The minimum mapping unit is 100 hectares for upland community types and 40 hectares for wetland communities. Vegetation classification was based on dominant overstory species.

The presence of vernal pools and upland areas with sensitive species in the ASP area has been added to the table "Vegetation Communities on Fort Hunter Liggett" and source information for the vegetation coverage map has been added to Figure 11.

**Comment: The various sedimentary rocks on Fort Hunter Liggett likely contain fossils. The draft study does not document these or discuss whether some areas might be significant.**

**Response:** Comment noted. Further study is needed to determine whether significant resources are present.

**Comment: There is no source for the assertion that much of the Nacimiento River dries up during most summers. In the years I worked on the floristic survey, flow was reduced during the summers but the river pools near the Palisades were not the only areas that retained flow. The pool near the old bridge in Training Area 26 remained quite deep during the summer, much deeper than pools near the Palisades.**

**Response:** The description of the Nacimiento River summer flow regime was taken from the Fort Hunter Liggett Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan FY2004-2008. The resource description in the draft study has been revised to acknowledge summer flow along other portions of the Nacimiento River.

**Comment: The Jolon area also includes populations of several special interest plant taxa (e.g., *Chlorogalum purpureum* var. *purpureum*, *Calycadenia villosa*, *Eriastrum luteum*).**

**Response:** The table "Federally and State Listed Threatened and Endangered Species that May Occur on Fort Hunter Liggett" has been revised to include the

Jolon populations of *Chlorogalum purpureum* var. *purpureum*, *Calycadenia villosa*.

**Comment: In Table 4 (p. 49) the authors incorrectly state that *Chlorogalum purpureum* var. *purpureum* only occurs at FHL.**

**Response:** This table has been revised to acknowledge populations of *Chlorogalum purpureum* var. *purpureum* at Camp Roberts.

**Comment: The populations of *Navarretia prostrata* in the vernal pool complexes in the ASP and around Jolon, together with those at Camp Roberts, may be the most viable populations left of this taxon.**

**Response:** The information has been included in the description of natural resource significance.

**Comment: Although *Malacothamnus palmeri* var. *involucratum* and *Malacothamnus davidsonii* are both generally considered to be shrubland taxa (i.e., chaparral, coastal sage scrub), both taxa are also found in ephemeral riparian areas on FHL.**

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment: The location of listed species for plants in Table 4 is incomplete. Comment letter provides additional location for plant species listed in this table.**

**Response:** This table has been revised to include the additional plant locations.

**Comment: Intact understory of native grasses is an extremely rare natural community and the lack of natural reproduction in valley oak woodlands is a critical feature in the California landscape. The upper San Antonio valley is one of the best sites of naturally reproducing oak in the region.**

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Public Concern: A significant resource that should be added to the draft study is Burro Mountain. It was highly recommended as a potential National Natural Landmark in the National Natural Landmark identification study of geologic resources of the South Pacific Border region. It was the subject of several detailed and thorough publications by USGS geologists. Burro Creek has cut down into the ophiolite creating beautiful exposures through the sequence. Burro Mountain and Point Sal, are probably the two best examples of ophiolites in the South Pacific Border region.**

**Response:** NPS will revise the resource description and include information on the significance of Burro Mountain in the description of natural resource significance and suitability.

**Comment: The description of natural resources does not match the detail and depth in the description of cultural features, and likewise for the geology compared to biology. As a result the resource assessment comes across as being a bit out of balance. Additional analysis and description of geologic resources at Fort Hunter Liggett should be included in the final study including:**

- A description of the origins of prominent geologic features; and
- An analysis of the relationships between geology and plant communities. There are clear associations between serpentinitic substrate and unique vegetation at FHL.

**Response:** NPS will revise the resource description and include additional information where necessary.

## Cultural Resources

**Comment: The history of the Salinans was not adequately recognized in the draft study.**

### Comments included:

- Salinans are described as if they only existed in the past. Many Salinan families still live in the region.
- p. 24 mentions only 2 groups of Salinans. The study should have also acknowledged the third group, the Playanos or Coastal People.
- p. 26 (removal of squatters): Salinan families (including Mora and Encinales families) were allowed to keep a 100-acre parcel.
- Salinans were an important part of the town of Jolon's history.
- Salinan Tribe founding of the Portola Trail: the trail from the coast up San Carpoforo Canyon to San Antonio Valley was used by the Salinans for millennia to connect the coast and valley people and to allow trading of resources from the different life zones.
- The Hacienda Hill was sacred to Salinans.
- Salinans occupied land at Fort Hunter Liggett for 10,000 years v. Hearst's 20 years.

**Response:** The NPS will revise text accordingly to accurately portray the history and significance of the Salinans.

**Comment: The cultural resources in Jolon Area (Table 2 of the draft) did not include the old cemetery in the Ammunition Supply Point (ASP) (ca. 4 air km due N of San Antonio River, ca. 5.5 air km due E of San Antonio River, approximate UTM's: zone 10S, 667000 E, 3981600 N).**

**Response:** NPS will add this site to the table " Documented Cultural Resources Within the Northern Cantonment and Jolon Areas."

**Comment: The draft study should examine the mineral resources and mining history of FHL. The mining history will relate closely to cultural history over the past century if not back to the mid- or late-1800s, particularly during the Gold Rush era and during wartimes when major national efforts were made to search for certain metals essential for military hardware. There may be gold and mercury prospects in the area, mainly related to ancient hot springs.**

**During WWII, the sources and transport of critical metals were in jeopardy. Particularly with the ties of the FHL to the military since 1940, this topic seems appropriate.**

**Response:** NPS will include the mining history and mineral resources of Fort Hunter Liggett in the " Resource Description" section.

**Comment: The draft study should have included photographs of the painted caves on FHL to highlight the fragile and precious nature of the art there and the need for extreme sensitivity to their preservation.**

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment: There are precious few places in California – indeed, the United States – that have the significance in cultural sites that FHL has. Any plans that impact those sites or potentially increase access to them are scrutinized by the Salinan Nation Cultural Preservation Association (SNCPA) as to the measures that will prevent negative impacts from occurring. SNCPA considers the protection of unique and rich resources to be of primary responsibility for the managers of FHL.**

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment: There are various technical corrections to the descriptions and analysis of resources related to William Randolph Hearst that should be made to the draft study.**

**Response:** The NPS will make the editorial corrections suggested in the comment.

**Comment: Was the bridge near the Palisades in Training Area 26 constructed as part of Burnett Road, or was it built by the Army?**

**Response:** This bridge was built by the Army after Burnett Road was constructed.

## Public Enjoyment of FHL Resources

**Comment:** The NPS could have mentioned the outstanding potential to provide for a wide array of resource-based recreation opportunities on the entire installation. It would be an outstanding addition to the National Park System, as it would to the California State Park System.

**Response:** Comment noted. The NPS has added a "Management Options and Opportunities" section to the final report which identifies ways in which the Army, on its own or in collaboration with other organizations, could provide further visitor opportunities on Fort Hunter Liggett. This section also describes the potential for management as a historic site, park or forest area, if any substantial part of the installation is determined to be excess to the Army's needs in the future.

**Comment:** Opposed to any references to a hunting and fishing program in the report. The hunting and fishing programs at FHL occur in that portion of the facility which is quite separate from the historic structures.

**Response:** Although the study recommendations only address the BRAC excess property, the draft study assesses resources and the potential for public enjoyment of the entire installation.

## FEASIBILITY

**Comment:** The National Park Service should have recommended that any future excess lands at Fort Hunter Liggett should become an NPS unit.

### Comments included:

- Continuance of FHL training mission and NPS budget constraints are limitations that may change over time.
- The study should recommend that NPS will seek Direct Transfer Authority legislation in the event the Fort is ever declared surplus to military needs.
- It does not make sense that the NPS cannot recommend transfer of any future excess lands at Fort Hunter Liggett, but the USFS has supported legislation that would transfer Fort Hunter Liggett to the Forest Service should it not be needed for national defense.
- Costs of UXO clean-up should not be a rationale for finding NPS management infeasible, as the Defense Department will be required to clean up the UXO prior to transfer of any lands.
- Entire installation should be jointly operated by the NPS and California State Parks if determined excess to the Army's needs.

**Response:** Based on the Army's recent determination that no land at Fort Hunter Liggett is excess to their needs, the feasibility section has been modified to state that it is not currently feasible to manage any part of Fort Hunter Liggett as a unit of the national park system, including the Milpitas Hacienda and related historic structures, because none of the land is available for management by the NPS. However, in the long term, if any of these areas are determined to be excess to the Army's needs, management by the NPS could potentially be feasible, including management of a historic site centered around the Milpitas Hacienda, or management of a larger park incorporating additional lands of Fort Hunter Liggett. In both cases, further analysis would need to be completed when/if a park area is proposed. Considerations would include the U.S. Forest Service right of first refusal on Fort Hunter Liggett excess properties, the status of clean-up of hazardous materials, public interest and support, social and economic impact, and financial capabilities.

**Comment:** National Park Service should issue a supplemental draft environmental assessment analyzing the future public benefit of National Forest versus National Park Service management, or a combination of the two. Any Congressional action should await such an analysis.

**Response:** Congress has already taken action, and provided the USFS with the right of first refusal for any future excess land at Fort Hunter Liggett (MILCON legislation, October 13, 2004).

**Comment:** Congress has failed to authorize adequate budgets for NPS to manage properly the parks it already has, much less to take on new obligations.

**Response:** Comment noted.

## ALTERNATIVES

**Note:** The following comments were based on the former alternatives presented in the draft study report. These alternatives are no longer being considered since the Army has determined that the property is no longer excess to their needs or available for transfer. The former draft alternatives are included for reference in an appendix of the final report.

### Management/Ownership of former BRAC Property

#### Comments:

- California State Parks does not wish to take on the BRAC properties without the possibility of a future partnership arrangement with the

National Park Service for managing more of the Fort Hunter Liggett land.

- A non-profit organization should be created to manage the holdings at Jolon, with a memorandum of understanding between the non-profit and the state or other agencies involved.
- Funding from BRAC property rentals could offset costs of acquisition and management of the property.
  - The BRAC areas could offset costs of NPS acquisition of properties and provide rentals for those who hunt and fish at FHL as well as long-term visitors at the San Antonio Mission.
  - Funding sources are needed for the Gil Adobe, Tidball Store and Dutton Hotel to ensure that management and protection are affordable. Some portion of the rents collected from the Javelin Court Housing area would be a stable source of income, which could be transferred to a non-profit caring for and maintaining these sites.
- California State Parks Department is significantly underfunded; however, the department has recently worked with a wide array of State agencies and nonprofit organizations to protect 82,000 acres of adjacent Hearst Ranch lands. California State Parks does not have funding, operational ability, or staffing to effectively provide stewardship for Fort Hunter Liggett lands.
- In the event that a transfer to State Parks does not occur, Monterey County is interested in obtaining the Hacienda complex.
- Various suggestions for transfer of the Tidball Store land:
  - The Tidball Store and the corresponding 1-acre of land should be transferred to the Salinan Nation.
  - The one acre on which the Tidball Store sits should be transferred to the Monterey County Parks Department since they already own the building.
  - Friends of the Historic San Antonio Mission is willing to explore the possibility of serving in an advisory capacity to any nonprofit or other organization that wished to step forward and assume management of the Tidball Store and Gil Adobe.

- NPS administration of the historic structures at FHL would be a positive step in the direction of providing improved preservation of the built environment on the installation. Buildings that have been largely ignored (i.e. Gil Adobe) may be stabilized and interpreted for interested public.
- Transferring the Milpitas Hacienda and ranch bungalows to California State Parks would help preserve and interpret these important cultural resources to a wider / more diverse audience. The National Park Service and California State Parks should jointly ensure protection for the Hacienda and the Tidball Store before serious deterioration takes place.
- Fort Hunter Liggett can be owned and managed by the National Park Service in partnership with California State Parks, under the existing cooperative agreement. Start by combining Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument with the Milpitas Hacienda into the National Park System.
- NPS should ensure that adequate funding is transferred to CSP for ongoing upkeep, maintenance, and proper curation of these facilities.
- Consider use of properties listed for use by Monterey County as a youth camp for individuals needing temporary confinement.

**Response:** Based on the Army's recent change in policy regarding the BRAC excess property at Fort Hunter Liggett, there is currently no land available for transfer or management by any other agency or organization. The NPS has added a "Management Options and Opportunities" section to the final special resource study report which identifies partnership and collaborative opportunities that the Army could pursue, in order to enhance preservation or visitor opportunities at the Milpitas Hacienda, Tidball Store, Gil Adobe, Salinan cultural sites, or other areas. California State Parks, Monterey County, local nonprofit groups, and Salinan groups are referenced as potential partners. The Management Options and Opportunities section of the report also describes the potential for management of a historic site, park, or forest area if additional property at Fort Hunter Liggett is determined to excess to the Army's needs in the future.

## Resource Protection

### Comments:

- Alternatives should have included options for protection of nationally significant resources on the entire FHL installation.

- There is no alternative that recognizes the importance of these resources on the entire FHL installation for preservation for the benefit of future generations as a unit of the National Park System.
- The disposition of federal military lands no longer needed for national defense that contain nationally significant resources that meet the qualifications for recognition as units of the National Park System should be decided in public with all alternatives made available for the public to scrutinize and comment on.
- **The final report should recommend future protection of the resources if and when land becomes available.**
  - include steps to ensure that the land stays in federal ownership (NPS or USFS) to protect resource values.
  - protect the Mission's cultural landscape in perpetuity.
  - include measures to limit presence of unexploded ordnance.
- **All Fort Hunter Liggett land located in the Nacimiento and San Antonio watershed should be conveyed to Monterey County Water Resources Agency, as they own and operate the Nacimiento and San Antonio Dams and are responsible for the water quality and quantity in their respective reservoirs.**

**Response:** The resource analysis in the draft report recognized the national significance of resources throughout Fort Hunter Liggett, and found the area suitable to be a national park unit. However, in a special resource study, the NPS is required by policy to evaluate only alternatives that are considered feasible. Management by NPS of Fort Hunter Liggett as a whole was found to be not feasible at the current time, therefore, the NPS did not develop alternatives for management of the entire installation.

Two recent policy changes have altered the management options considered in this study:

- legislation providing the US Forest Service with the right of first refusal on any land determined excess to the military's needs; and
- an Army decision that the former BRAC excess property at Fort Hunter Liggett is essential to their mission, and therefore there is currently no land available for transfer or management by any other agency or organization.

The NPS has added a "Management Options and Opportunities" section to the final special resource study report which describes ways in which the Army could supplement their efforts to care for the nationally significant natural and cultural resources of Fort Hunter

Liggett, and help to ensure that they maintain their condition and integrity. It also describes the potential for management of a historic site, park, or forest area if additional property at Fort Hunter Liggett is determined to be excess to the Army's needs in the future. Appropriate agencies for management of these areas would need to be determined if they become available.

**Comment: NPS should have an advisory role to FHL while it is an active military installation assisting in conserving both the many cultural and many natural resources at FHL.**

**Response:** Natural, cultural, and historical resources of Army-managed property will continue to be managed under existing Army programs and in compliance with NEPA and other federal laws. A "Management Options and Opportunities" section has been added to the report, listing several ways in which the Army could work with the National Park Service and other agencies and organizations to protect the resources of Fort Hunter Liggett. It will be up to the Army to pursue any of these opportunities.

### **Collaboration / Management of Salinan Cultural Sites**

**Comments:**

- **Alternatives that consider joint stewardship with Salinan groups should be considered:**
  - The Salinan history precedes other historic periods represented in the area and continues today.
  - There are NPS units that have joint agreements with tribes.
  - Consider collaboration with the Salinans at the Mission especially since the Salinans created most of the artifacts there.
- **The BRAC property / other installation property should be returned to the Salinan people:**
  - If NPS does not have operational ability to take jurisdiction of the BRAC property, then the NPS should deed the land to the Salinan Tribal Council. The Salinans have sincere concern for natural and cultural resources and has ability to administer the property for benefit of the people.
  - Military should retain ownership and control of the BRAC property until it can be arranged to turn them over to the stewardship of the Salinan Tribe.
  - Indigenous groups have the right of first refusal on surplus federal lands if they can demonstrate a tie to said lands.
- **The alternatives should address ways to prevent impacts on Salinan cultural sites.**

**Response:** Based on a recent Army decision, the former BRAC properties are no longer available for transfer and will remain under ownership and management of the US Army. Therefore there are no alternatives presented in this report. However, the NPS has added a "Management Options and Opportunities" section to the report, which describes several ways in which the Army, National Park Service and California State Parks, and other organizations could collaborate with Salinan groups. The Mission is managed by the Diocese of Monterey, which could also collaborate with Salinan groups.

Federally recognized tribes interested in acquiring future BRAC property could work through the Bureau of Indian Affairs to obtain available land. The Bureau of Indian Affairs, as a federal agency, can request excess federal property on behalf of a federally recognized tribe.

## ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

**Note:** *The following comments and responses address the "Environmental Consequences" section of the environmental assessment that was included in the draft study report. Because no actions or alternatives are being considered, the environmental assessment will not be completed. The former alternatives and environmental assessment from the draft study report are included in Appendix I. The following responses acknowledge data corrections and other concerns that are still applicable.*

### Roads / Traffic

**Comment:** Traffic counts referenced are from 1995. The Jolon Road/ Pine Canyon Road area has experienced significant growth in recent years and traffic counts should be updated to accurately reflect current conditions.

**Response:** The fifth paragraph of the traffic and circulation information in the "Affected Environment" section should be revised to read "Highest volume was recorded at the section of Jolon Road between ~~San Lucas Road~~ and US 101, at 6,900 Pine Canyon Road and US 101, at an average of 7,900 vehicles per day."

**Comment:** To support conclusions on the significance of impacts, the document should provide level of service calculations for all impact County roads based on the latest edition of the Highway Capacity Manual.

**Response:** Comment noted. Because the environmental assessment will not be completed, such analysis will not be undertaken.

**Comment:** The document inaccurately identifies the level of service (LOS) standard for Monterey

**County as D. Monterey County considers LOS C or better to be acceptable roadway operating conditions.**

**Response:** The fifth paragraph of the traffic and circulation information in the "Affected Environment" section should be revised to read "Monterey County considers LOS ~~"D"~~ "C" or better to be acceptable roadway operating conditions."

**Comment:** The cumulative impact analysis does not sufficiently discuss the cumulative impacts of project alternatives to County roads.

**Response:** Comment noted. Because the environmental assessment will not be completed, further analysis will not be undertaken.

### Native American Resources

**Comments:**

- **Alternative A fails to address current impacts on Salinan cultural sites.**
- **The study fails to discuss how Native American resources could be adequately preserved if higher levels of access and popularity occur. Alternative B: Transfer to CSP and management of some of the properties for increased visitation will lead to significant additional public access to the base overall. The properties that would be the focus for visitation are concentrated in the cantonment area but roads to these sites easily allow access to unintended and unprotected areas.**
- **Although FHL does not authorize open access to the base, illicit visits to our cultural sites have occurred in the past, due to the lack of sufficient patrol staff. The size of the base and budget restraints preclude true protection from illegal access. Having attractions on the base that are managed by CSP will only exacerbate this problem without steps to address it. This report should look into this issue more closely and suggest adequate measures to counter these negative effects.**

**Response:** Based on the Army's recent change in policy regarding the BRAC excess property at Fort Hunter Liggett, there is currently no land available for transfer or management by any other agency or organization. All resources will continue to be managed by the Army. The Army will continue to manage and patrol roads and other areas. Army resource management staff will continue to work with Salinan groups. The NPS has added a "Management Options and Opportunities" section to the final study report which suggests that the Army could explore additional opportunities to allow for Salinan use of important cultural sites and to interpret the history and culture of the Salinan people.

The Army's resource management plans for Fort Hunter Liggett acknowledge that site damage due to facility operations, military training activities, and vandalism does occur. The Army's site preservation efforts include archeological site marking and monitoring programs, site clearance processes, training and education of installation personnel regarding cultural resource conservation. Federal agencies are required to withhold sensitive information regarding its location that could put a site at risk for being damaged. However the Army has found that the benefits of site marking for avoidance outweigh the potential risks from vandalism.

Visitation to Fort Hunter Liggett may increase even under continued Army management, as the Milpitas Hacienda and the Mission have been featured in travel publications and generally have become better known. Education about the importance of protecting cultural resources, combined with patrols and enforcement efforts to discourage destructive behavior may help to counter negative effects.

**Comment: It is ludicrous to plan a tourist attraction in an isolated area for only 1 building – it can be assumed that the Mission and Salinan cultural sites were an unspoken part of the plan.**

**Response:** The study evaluated the significance and suitability of the resources of the entire Fort Hunter Liggett installation, but only evaluated management alternatives for land available for transfer, i.e. the Milpitas Hacienda and related historic structures. Management was planned not in isolation, but in conjunction with CSP management of Hearst Castle®. Opportunities for collaboration with the Monterey Diocese in their management of visitor use of the Mission San Antonio de Padua were identified (p.115 of draft report); these actions would be at the discretion of the Monterey Diocese.

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

### Comments:

- The NPS and Army Corps of Engineers should construct a 25 mile highway "Pleasure Road" between the Hacienda and Hearst Castle. It will add to the economy of the region and would enhance the significance of the national park concept. It would be an opportunity to exploit the Portola trail.
- NPS could be a partner in the use of campgrounds on the Nacimiento-Fergusson road and in the National Forest area.
- The Mission could be a major factor in public use of the area if the Diocese no longer staffs the Mission in the future.

- Granting federal recognition to the Salinans and returning the fort's 165,000 acres to them is the best solution: reservations boost local economies; tribes welcome respectful visitors to their lands; everyone benefits.

**Response:** These comments cover areas and issues that are beyond the scope of this study.

**Comment: The federal and state resource agencies have a clear need for emergency training such as fire suppression and fuel management.**

**Response:** Comment noted.

**Comment: While the major mission of NPS of preservation for future generations is closer to CSP than is the multiple-use mission of the Forest Service, we recognize the logic of favoring an agency that already borders it on the north and west.**

**Response:** Comment noted.

Comment: The reconstruction of the San Lucas/Lockwood Road referred to in Appendix H: Summary of Public Comments, p. 201 (in the draft study report) was completed in the period between 2001 and 2003.

**Response:** Comment noted.

## Appendix I: Former Alternatives and Environmental Assessment sections Included in Draft Fort Hunter Liggett Special Resource Study and Environmental Assessment

***The former “Alternatives” and “Environmental Assessment” sections from the draft study report are reprinted here for reference. They are no longer under consideration.***

### Alternatives

#### Introduction

Two management options for the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) excess property at Fort Hunter Liggett are presented as alternatives in this chapter. No alternatives involving National Park Service (NPS) ownership or management are presented, since NPS ownership and management have been found to be not feasible (See “Feasibility” chapter).

**Alternative A: No Action.** Under this alternative, the Army would retain the excess property in interim use status for an indefinite period, during which minimal or no maintenance activities would be conducted. No change in use is expected for any of the excess property during this interim period. The Army would continue to manage the remainder of the Fort Hunter Liggett installation. The NPS would have no involvement in the ownership or management of any Fort Hunter Liggett structures or properties. At some future time, it is assumed that the Army would pursue one of the options outlined in the Army’s *Environmental Assessment for the Disposal and Reuse of the BRAC Property at Fort Hunter Liggett* or would take other action, at their discretion.

**Alternative B: Addition to Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument and Designation as an Affiliated Area of the National Park System.** Under this alternative, legislation would authorize direct transfer of the Milpitas Hacienda complex and the ranch bungalows to California State Parks to be managed as an addition to Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument (Hearst Castle®) and as an affiliated area of the national park system.

Legislation would authorize direct transfer of the Gil Adobe and the one acre of land under and adjacent to the Tidball Store to California State Parks or Monterey County Parks Department. An agreement with a nonprofit organization could be developed in order to provide for management of these sites at little or no cost to the public agency.

This alternative includes an option for the Javelin Court area, including 41 housing units, to be transferred to California State Parks to be operated as rental housing. The revenue from managing the housing area could be used to partially offset operating costs of the Milpitas Hacienda complex and the ranch bungalows.

### Alternative A: No Action

(see Figures 12 & 13, Alternative A, in the “Figures” section [of the draft study report])

#### OVERVIEW

Under Alternative A, the Army would retain the excess property in interim use status for an indefinite period, during which the Army would conduct minimal or no maintenance. No change in use is expected for any of the excess property during this interim period. The Milpitas Hacienda would be operated by a concessioner for lodging and food service. The Army and California State Parks have negotiated an interim lease for the Milpitas Hacienda to provide for ongoing management until longer-term disposal or transfer is implemented. The ranch bungalows would be used for housing, storage, and other non-public uses. The Gil Adobe and the Tidball Store would continue to be unused. The Army would continue to manage the remainder of the Fort Hunter Liggett installation. The National Park Service would have no involvement in the ownership or management of any Fort Hunter Liggett structures or properties. At some future time, it is assumed that the Army would pursue one of the options outlined in the Army’s *Environmental Assessment for the Disposal and Reuse of the BRAC Property at Fort Hunter Liggett* or would take other action, at their discretion.

#### LANDOWNERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

The Army environmental assessment includes two options that do not involve the NPS: a no-action option and an encumbered disposal option. The Army’s no-action option would place the excess property into non-use status for an indefinite period, during which minimal or no maintenance activities would be conducted. The Army’s encumbered disposal option would involve transferring ownership of the property to others, while retaining certain Army rights, such as for utility easements or remediation of hazardous materials. Transfer to California State Parks, Monterey County Parks Department, or another public agency could eventually be accomplished through this encumbered disposal option, either through establishment of a local reuse authority or by declaring the property surplus to the federal government and transferring it under the Federal Lands to Parks Program. However, the timing and outcome of this approach are uncertain.

Currently, the Milpitas Hacienda is open to the public, with lodging and food service provided by a concessioner under a month-to-month lease. The Army has negotiated an interim lease with California State Parks, under which public use and services are expected to remain as they are now. Several ranch bungalows are rented for residential use. The Tidball Store and the Gil Adobe are not in use, and receive minimal maintenance. No change in use is expected for any of the excess property in the immediate future. It is anticipated that no investments in repair or rehabilitation of any of the excess property would be made during this interim period, other than routine maintenance activities.

California State Parks currently conducts law enforcement / firearms training at Fort Hunter Liggett, and is also discussing a possible longer term lease for a law enforcement training center at Fort Hunter Liggett. These activities are not related to the excess property at Fort Hunter Liggett, but may affect California State Parks's use of the excess property.

#### **VISITOR USE AND INTERPRETATION**

The Milpitas Hacienda would likely continue to be accessible to visitors, pending eventual transfer to a state or local agency or other entity. No additional visitor services, programs, or facilities would be developed. The Gil Adobe and Tidball Store would remain closed to public use. Mission San Antonio de Padua would continue to be accessible to the visiting public and to parishioners, as determined by the Monterey Diocese. The cantonment area, Jolon and Nacimiento-Fergusson roads, and other public roads, would continue to remain open to the public, with certain security constraints. Visitors to the Milpitas Hacienda and the Mission San Antonio de Padua would arrive at Fort Hunter Liggett primarily via Jolon Road, from Highway 101 and the Salinas Valley, near King City, or via Nacimiento-Fergusson Road, from Highway 1 and the Pacific Coast. The Army would continue to manage hunting and fishing activities using their permit system.

#### **RESOURCE PROTECTION**

Natural, cultural, and historical resources of Army-managed property would continue to be managed under existing Army programs. The Army would continue to prepare environmental compliance documents as needed for training and other operations, in accordance with the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966. Little or no funding would be available for management of the resource values of the excess property during the interim management period. Natural resource values of the excess properties are minimal; no natural resource protection activities related to the excess property are anticipated.

#### **OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**

Under Alternative A, the Army would continue its current operation at Fort Hunter Liggett. The Army would continue to be responsible for the maintenance and operation of the BRAC excess property during the interim use period. While the Milpitas Hacienda is leased out, routine maintenance would be the responsibility of the lessee (the current concessioner or California State Parks). Long term maintenance or rehabilitation would be deferred.

#### **IMPLEMENTATION COSTS**

Under Alternative A, California State Parks would incur some level of administrative costs associated with the interim lease and concessioner contract for the Milpitas Hacienda. These costs are expected to be carried by the Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument. The eventual costs to the Army to transfer the excess properties to other parties through a local reuse authority or Federal Lands to Parks program are expected to be

higher than for direct transfer to California State Parks; however, the magnitude of these costs is not known. There would be no costs to the NPS.

### **Alternative B: Addition to Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument and Designation as an Affiliated Area of the National Park System.**

(See Figures 14 & 15, Alternative B in the "Figures" section)

#### **OVERVIEW**

Under this alternative, legislation would authorize direct transfer of the Milpitas Hacienda complex and the ranch bungalows to California State Parks to be managed as an addition to Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument (Hearst Castle®) and as an affiliated area of the national park system. A separate study would be prepared by the NPS to consider the addition of the Milpitas Hacienda and the ranch bungalows to the Hearst San Simeon Estate National Historic Landmark (NHL).

The Gil Adobe and the Tidball Store are listed on the National Register of Historic Places at the local level of significance. Legislation would authorize direct transfer of these sites to California State Parks or Monterey County Parks Department. An agreement with a nonprofit organization could be developed in order to provide for management of these sites at little or no cost to the public agency.

This alternative includes an option for transfer of the Javelin Court area, including 41 housing units to California State Parks to be operated as rental housing. The revenue from managing the housing area could be used to partially offset operating costs of the Milpitas Hacienda complex and the ranch bungalows.

#### **LANDOWNERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT**

Under Alternative B, Congressional legislation would authorize direct transfer of the following areas to California State Parks to be operated as an addition to Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument and as an affiliated area of the national park system:

##### **■ The Milpitas Hacienda complex:**

- ❖ The Milpitas Hacienda (Building 101)
- ❖ Additional support structures: swimming pool (Building 100), toilet/shower facility (Building 100A), pool service building (Building 100B), storage building (Building 130), and tennis court (Building 103)
- ❖ approximately 21 acres of land on which the Milpitas Hacienda is situated, known as "Hacienda Hill".

- **Five ranch bungalows** (Buildings 124, 127, 131, 132A, and 149), including appropriate land around each.

California State Parks would manage the Milpitas Hacienda and nearby ranch bungalows as part of its Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument (Hearst Castle) operation, as an element of William Randolph Hearst's extensive estate. It is assumed that the Milpitas Hacienda lodging and restaurant facilities would continue to be operated by a concessioner or other public/private arrangement.

The ranch bungalows (buildings 124, 131, 132A and 149), some of which are part of the historic ranching landscape, would be available for uses such as office space, concessions, visitor center, staff housing, or as additional operational space needed for the Milpitas Hacienda operation.

Legislation would authorize the direct transfer of the Gil Adobe (Building 640) and one acre of land under and adjacent to the Tidball Store to either California State Parks or Monterey County Parks Department. These properties in the Jolon area are both listed on the National Register of Historic Places at the local level of significance. An agreement with a nonprofit organization could be developed in order to provide for management of these sites at little or no cost to the public agency that accepts ownership. The Ventana Conservation and Land Trust and Monterey County Parks Department have discussed the potential for collaborative management of these sites to interpret the history of the town of Jolon. Further analysis is needed to determine the viability of such an arrangement. The Monterey County Parks Department owns the Tidball Store structure, and would therefore be a logical agency to assume ownership of the land it sits upon.

As in Alternative A, California State Parks may continue to conduct law enforcement / firearms training or enter into a longer term lease for a law enforcement training center at Fort Hunter Liggett. These activities are not related to the excess property at Fort Hunter Liggett, but may provide for operational efficiencies.

Fort Hunter Liggett, other than the transferred BRAC excess property, would continue to be owned and managed by the U.S. Army.

**Designation as an affiliated area of the national park system.** Affiliated areas are nationally significant areas not owned or administered by the NPS, but which draw on technical or financial assistance from the NPS (NPS 2001b). As discussed in the feasibility chapter of this draft study report, the Milpitas Hacienda meets the criteria for designation as an affiliated area of the national park system. The ranch bungalows would be included in the affiliated area as they were part of the historic landscape setting when the Milpitas Hacienda functioned as the northern ranching headquarters for the larger estate, and they contribute to its interpretation.

Initial discussions with California State Parks identified several areas of NPS assistance and expertise that could contribute to effective management of the resources, including:

- Assistance in developing a management plan for the Milpitas Hacienda;
- Assistance in documenting the history and significance of the Milpitas Hacienda as part of Hearst's historic estate, assessing the condition of the building, and developing historic preservation treatment plans;
- Assistance in analysis and planning for the cultural landscape;
- Assistance in developing a long range interpretive plan;
- Assistance in developing funding sources for rehabilitation or restoration.

Congressional legislation would be required for designation of an affiliated area of the national park system. Further discussion with California State Parks would be necessary prior to designation to ensure that state management standards and procedures for park management are acceptable to the NPS.

#### VISITOR USE AND INTERPRETATION

**Milpitas Hacienda.** California State Parks would interpret the Milpitas Hacienda and associated structures as an element of Hearst's vast Central California estate and an example of the design and construction collaboration between Hearst and Julia Morgan. The Milpitas Hacienda provides an opportunity for experiential interpretation of the Hearst's estate. In contrast to the tightly controlled tours at Hearst Castle, visitors to the Milpitas Hacienda can linger, explore on their own, dine in the rooms where Hearst entertained his guests, and stay overnight in the rooms where Hearst housed his guests and employees.

In the short term, visitor services would be limited to those provided by the Milpitas Hacienda concessioner. This would include a restaurant and overnight accommodations at the Milpitas Hacienda. Over time, California State Parks would develop signage, displays, brochures, tours, and educational programs to interpret the Hearst and Morgan stories. California State Parks would integrate their interpretation and visitor services at the Milpitas Hacienda with those at Hearst Castle, and offer the visitor a more comprehensive view of Hearst's extensive estate.

**Mission San Antonio de Padua.** The Mission San Antonio de Padua is an active parish and an inholding, owned by the Monterey Diocese, within the Fort Hunter Liggett boundary. It is not the subject of this study. Nevertheless, there may be opportunities for collaboration to enhance services for visitors to both the Mission and the Milpitas Hacienda. The National Park Service or California State Parks could collaborate with the Monterey Diocese on the development of interpretive materials, such as brochures and wayside signs. Mission San Antonio de Padua represents important aspects of California and U.S. history, as well as a key chapter in the story of the Catholic Church. The NPS or California State Parks could collaborate with the Mission to tell stories of early California exploration and settlement, including the 1769 arrival of Spanish Captain Gaspar de Portola, the 1771 founding of the Mission San Antonio de Padua by

Father Junipero Serra, and the 1775 expedition of Juan Bautista de Anza. California State Parks staff or docents could offer walking tours to interpret early Mission life, based on remnants of the aqueduct, mill, orchards, vineyards, cemetery, washing facilities, Indian quarters and other features. The NPS could work with the Mission and Fort Hunter Liggett to interpret this portion of the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail.

California State Parks and the National Park Service could offer assistance to the Monterey Diocese in areas such as interpretation and visitor education, historic preservation, building condition assessment, museum curation, artifact conservation, conservation of the historic landscape surrounding the Mission, docent training, and management / operation of the gift shop. The NPS, California State Parks, and the Monterey Diocese have discussed drafting a memorandum of understanding to establish the basis for possible future collaboration.

**Gil Adobe and the Tidball Store.** These structures could potentially be rehabilitated for visitor use and to interpret the gold rush-era homesteading and mining boom in Jolon. Substantial investment would be involved, and further analysis is needed to identify viable uses and funding strategies. According to the Gil Adobe Preservation Plan, the Gil Adobe could be rehabilitated to support interpretive functions for visitors (Allen and Sanchez 1993), but it would require substantial financial investment. Seismic retrofitting, repair of the adobe walls and roof, electrical and mechanical systems and plumbing would likely be needed to accommodate visitors. Monterey County and the Salinan Tribe previously pursued a lease arrangement to make the Tidball Store available to the Salinan Tribe. Lease arrangements were never completed, however, and to date, Monterey County has been unable to find appropriate and viable uses for the building.

**Access.** As in Alternative A, visitors to the Milpitas Hacienda and the Mission San Antonio de Padua would arrive at Fort Hunter Liggett primarily via Jolon Road, from Highway 101 and the Salinas Valley, near King City. Some visitors would arrive via the more scenic but circuitous Nacimiento-Fergusson Road, from Highway 1 and the Pacific Coast. The cantonment area and the public roads on the installation would be open to the public, with certain security constraints. Visitors wishing to combine a visit to the Milpitas Hacienda with a visit to Hearst Castle could either travel 1.5 hours via Jolon Road and Highways 101, 46 and 1; or travel a 2.5 hour scenic route via Nacimiento-Fergusson Road and Highway 1.

Hunting and fishing access would continue under Army permit as in Alternative A. Hunters and anglers could take advantage of visitor services at the Milpitas Hacienda.

#### **RESOURCE PROTECTION**

Preservation covenants and protective easements are required to be included in the real estate transfer documents for property listed on the National Register of Historic Places to ensure long-

term preservation of the property's historic significance (36 CFR 800.5 [a] [2] [vii]). This would apply to the Milpitas Hacienda and the Gil Adobe, and possibly to the land around the Tidball Store.

California State Parks would manage the historically significant structures in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and Public Resources Code 5024.5 (inventory and management plan for cultural resources). Building condition assessments would be undertaken to determine more specific preservation, rehabilitation and restoration needs. California State Parks would seek to maintain or enhance the quality of the cultural landscape surrounding the Milpitas Hacienda. California State Parks could request technical assistance in resource protection from the NPS in areas such as cultural landscape conservation, historic preservation, and architectural history. A separate study would be prepared by the NPS to consider the addition of the Milpitas Hacienda to the Hearst San Simeon Estate National Historic Landmark. The Army would not conduct or contribute to the cost of the study.

Protection of the cultural resource values of the Gil Adobe and Tidball Store may depend upon finding economically viable uses for these structures. Ideally, the owner or manager of these sites would develop plans to protect and use the structures and to address the archeological resources of the sites.

Natural resource values of the excess properties are minimal: most of the area is paved, built-upon or landscaped. Therefore no particular natural resource protection activities are anticipated. Natural, cultural, and historical resources of Army-managed property would continue to be managed under existing Army programs as described in Alternative A.

#### **OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE**

Under Alternative B, California State Parks would be responsible for maintenance of the Milpitas Hacienda complex and the ranch bungalows. It is assumed that the Milpitas Hacienda would continue to be managed by a concessioner to provide lodging and food service. Appropriate maintenance standards would be specified in a concession contract, and routine maintenance would likely be the responsibility of the concessioner. Capital investments and improvements could occur in the long term and would need to be negotiated between California State Parks and the concessioner.

In the near term, several ranch bungalows would continue to be leased to the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) on an interim basis as residences for USFS fire crew members, until needed by California State Parks. In the long-term, California State Parks could use the ranch bungalows for visitor services, office space, or staff housing.

California State Parks would negotiate with Fort Hunter Liggett to provide certain services, such as law enforcement, emergency medical services, water supply and wastewater, electricity, and telecommunications. In the near term, the Army could provide law

enforcement and emergency services on a per call basis. In the longer term, California State Parks could have a law enforcement presence in the area in coordination with the Army. California State Parks and the US Army could enter into a concurrent jurisdiction agreement to address law enforcement issues.

The local or state agency accepting transfer of the Gil Adobe and land under the Tidball Store would be responsible for maintenance and operation of these areas, possibly through a management agreement with a nonprofit organization.

Roads providing access to the Milpitas Hacienda, ranch bungalows and other BRAC excess property would be retained and maintained by the US Army. California State Parks would need appropriate authorizations and agreements for the use of roadways retained by the Army for access to acquired structures and properties. Any additional driveways or parking areas created to directly support visitors to the historic site would be maintained by California State Parks. The county would continue to maintain the county roads.

#### IMPLEMENTATION COSTS

Table 14: Alternative B Implementation Costs includes a summary of costs for the addition of the Milpitas Hacienda complex and ranch bungalows to the Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument. Costs associated with the Gil Adobe and Tidball Store were not estimated as no specific management proposals are presented as part of this draft study report. Financial analysis would be needed as part of any re-use proposal.

Initial one-time costs would include environmental site assessments and surveys, and various planning reports related to the protection and interpretation of the historic structures and resources. It is assumed that the real property would be transferred without reimbursement to the Army of the real property's value. Transfer to California State Parks would only be feasible if reimbursement of the real property costs is waived. The Army would not be responsible for any implementation costs, other than their own costs for property transfer.

Capital costs for the development of the Milpitas Hacienda complex and ranch bungalows would include the renovation of one of the ranch bungalows for use as a visitor center and administrative offices for park staff, and the development of interpretive panels and signage. It is assumed that lodging and food service at the Hacienda would continue to be run by a concessioner. An analysis of the feasibility of continued use of the Hacienda for hospitality suggests that renovations would be necessary to continue successful concession-based lodging and food service operation. Such renovations would be made by the concessioner. The costs of renovation could be financed by an increase in room rates (Bay Area Economics 2001). It is also likely that a more stable concession contract (vs. the current month-to-month arrangement) and marketing in conjunction with Hearst Castle® could substantially increase occupancy rates.

Routine maintenance and day-to-day operation of the Milpitas Hacienda would be the responsibility of the concessioner, as specified in a contract between California State Parks and the concessioner. Ongoing maintenance on the ranch bungalows would be the responsibility of California State Parks.

Park operational costs for the Milpitas Hacienda and other excess property would include portions of staff positions based at Hearst Castle.® Law enforcement and fire services could be contracted with the Army or the USFS.

As an affiliated area of the national park system, the Milpitas Hacienda would be eligible for technical and financial assistance from the National Park Service. The NPS has the authority to enter into agreements to share costs or services in carrying out authorized functions and responsibilities in affiliated areas (16 U.S.C. Sec. 1f). Given existing financial constraints within the NPS, it is expected that financial and technical assistance will be limited. The cost of this technical assistance is estimated at up to \$50,000 per year for central office staff time or contracted projects. These costs may be incurred on an irregular basis, depending on need and availability of funding.

#### JAVELIN COURT OPTION

Under this option, the Javelin Court housing area in the Milpitas Housing Complex would be transferred to California State Parks for continued management as rental housing. The Javelin Court area consists of the following:

- 41 housing units, 2–4 bedrooms each. Arranged in 12 multi-unit buildings (Buildings P18 through P29) of 2–4 units each.
- Playground and shade structure (Buildings P32, P37)
- Approximately 3.5 acres of land.

California State Parks could manage the housing units at the Javelin Court area through a concessioner, contract, or nonprofit organization. Costs and revenues are described in Table 15, Javelin Court Area – Costs and Revenues. Over the first 25 years of operation by California State Parks, these housing units are projected to provide surplus revenue which could be used to partially offset the costs of operation of the Milpitas Hacienda area. California State Parks could contract with Fort Hunter Liggett to provide structural and grounds maintenance of the housing complex, if such services are available. Emergency / law enforcement response could be handled on a percall basis under contract with the Army.

## Affected Environment

This environmental assessment analyzes the potential effects of each alternative proposed in the Draft Fort Hunter Liggett Special Resource Study. This "Affected Environment" chapter describes the baseline environmental conditions at Fort Hunter Liggett which may be affected by the alternatives. Alternatives address the transfer of historic and non-historic structures and their immediately surrounding grounds. Because actions in the alternatives are not expected to affect natural resources, this chapter does not describe natural resources (see "Environmental Consequences" chapter for further analysis, and "Resource Description" chapter for a detailed description of natural resources).

Portions of the following section were adapted from the *Final Environmental Assessment for the Disposal and Reuse of the BRAC Property at Fort Hunter Liggett*, September 2000, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

## Cultural Resources

For purposes of this analysis, archeological resources and historic structures have been assessed by geographic location. The northern cantonment area includes the vicinity surrounding the Hacienda complex and the ranch bungalows, and the Jolon area includes the vicinity surrounding the Tidball Store land and the Gil Adobe. There do not appear to be cultural resources associated with the Javelin Court housing area. A detailed account of the study area's historical context can be found in the "Resource Description" chapter of the *Special Resource Study*.

### NORTH CANTONMENT AREA

**Archeological Resources.** Four archeological surveys have been conducted in the northern cantonment area and four archeological sites have been identified (see Table 2 in the "Resource Description" chapter). These sites include CA-MNT-891H, a multi-component site with prehistoric datable materials; CA-MNT-1566H, the San Antonio Mission Water System; CA-MNT-1569H, the Sanchez Adobe (Ditch Tender's Adobe); and portions of CA-MNT-1563H, the Camino Real / Caretta Trail. In addition, there are other archeological sites associated with the Mission San Antonio de Padua area, which is an inholding within Fort Hunter Liggett. Some of these sites have been documented, while other sites are continuing to be uncovered and studied. Also located in the vicinity of this area is a portion of the Juan Bautista de Anza National Historic Trail. None of these sites are located within the BRAC excess property. The landscape elements of the Milpitas Ranch House (Milpitas Hacienda) property were assigned a site number, CA-MNT-940H, by the State of California. The Milpitas Hacienda is described in more detail in the Historic Structures section below (US Army Corps of Engineers 2000b).

**Historic Structures.** Table 1 in the "Resource Description" chapter provides a complete list of buildings constructed prior to 1945 located on or near the BRAC property. Seven of these

structures are within the northern cantonment area, the most prominent of which is the Milpitas Hacienda (Building 101). The Milpitas Hacienda is the only nationally significant, National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-listed building within this area. The Milpitas Hacienda was listed on the NRHP in 1977. Its condition is described in the "Resource Description" and "Significance" chapters of this draft study report.

Of the other pre-1945 buildings that are BRAC property, only buildings 124, 131 (the chicken coop), and 149 (El Piojo Ranch House) are BRAC property. These structures, dating from the Consolidation Period, were determined ineligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. While it has some historic interest related to Hearst operations, Building 124 has been heavily altered and has lost its historical integrity. Both the original one-story residence and the 1930s-1940s addition are in fair to good condition, although the rear lacks a perimeter foundation. Building 131 has been well maintained and is in good condition despite its age. Building 149 is well maintained and appears to be in good condition. Although it has lost its historical integrity through alteration and relocation, Building 149 is the least altered and best structure of its type on Fort Hunter Liggett (US Army Corps of Engineers 2000b).

Additional historic structures in the vicinity of the ranch bungalows and Milpitas Hacienda include Building 111 (housing), Building 119 (blacksmith shop) and Building 120 (Tin Barn or Fire Station). These structures are not part of the BRAC excess property. Building 111 was built prior to 1945 and is most likely associated with the Hearst Ranch and the James Brown Cattle Company. This building was used by Fort Hunter Liggett for installation housing until 1990 when it was abandoned and boarded up. The exact date of construction of this building is unknown, but it was most likely built as a ranch house for either the Brown or Hearst cattle operations. Building 119 was originally a blacksmith shop that was part of the Hearst's Milpitas Ranch complex. Its exact construction date is unknown and it may have been built by the James Brown Cattle Company. Building 120, the Tin Barn, was built by the James Brown Cattle Company, reportedly using roof trusses salvaged from the 1915 Panama Pacific Exposition in San Francisco. This building was also a part of Hearst's ranching operations. Fort Hunter Liggett reused this barn at different times as a Post Exchange, theater, library, and gymnasium, before it was converted for use by the Fire Department in 1988. All three structures were determined ineligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 2000b).

### JOLON AREA

**Archeological Resources.** Five archeological sites have been identified in the vicinity of the Jolon town site. However, only one archeological site is located on the Tidball Store site, CA-MNT-794H. The other sites in the vicinity of this area include CA-MNT-693H, the historic Jolon Town site; CA-MNT-1081H/1561H, Saint Luke's Episcopal Church; CA-MNT-1088H, Saint Luke's

Cemetery; and CA-MNT-1562H, the Jolon Stage Route (US Army Corps of Engineers 2000b).

Five surveys have been conducted in the vicinity of the Gil Adobe. These surveys identified one archeological site, CA-MNT-963H, the Jose Maria Gil Adobe, which contains both archeological and architectural components. Three other sites have been recorded in the vicinity. These include CA-MNT-793H, the Portola Camp; CA-MNT-1089H, the Gil Family Cemetery; and portions of CA-MNT-1563H, the Camino Real/Caretta Trail. As of September 2000, an investigation was in progress to record a large, complex multi-component site between the Gil Adobe and the Gil Family Cemetery. The site includes prehistoric materials, historic fencing, and barn remains and is believed to have a high likelihood for human remains. This site is outside the BRAC property.

**Historic Structures.** Historic structures within the Jolon area include the Tidball Store, Saint Luke's Church and Cemetery, and the Dutton Hotel. All of these structures were built prior to 1940. The Dutton Hotel was constructed before Hearst purchased the land in 1920. All of these structures are listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) as locally significant. The Tidball Store is the only historic building in this area on BRAC property. Saint Luke's Church and Cemetery and the Dutton Hotel do not belong to Fort Hunter Liggett. No other historic structures are located within this area (Eidsness and Jackson 1994b).

There are no other historic structures in the vicinity of the Jose Maria Gil Adobe (Building 640). The Gil Adobe was listed on the NRHP in 1974 as an individual property. Built in 1865, the structure was modified through the years. The Miller family that purchased the Gil land in 1909 modified the area to accommodate dairy operations. Additional modifications were made for military use between 1941 and the mid-1970s when the adobe served as Bachelor Officers Quarters (Eidsness and Jackson 1994b).

### Visual Resources

The quality of visual resources surrounding the historic properties and the larger landscape setting are important to preserving their cultural resource values. Areas where the setting and surrounding landscape have remained intact from the pre-military era provide an opportunity to interpret the cultural resources in their historic context. While much of the vegetation within the cantonment area was replaced by military and residential land uses, the remainder of the installation retains highly scenic qualities associated with the rolling oak woodlands, oak savannas and riparian zones on the eastern side, and the chaparral covered peaks of the Santa Lucia Range on the west side.

Scenic landscapes on the installation can be experienced from travel on public roads. The Army permits public travel on Mission Creek, Del Venturi, Sam Jones, and Nacimiento-Fergusson roads as long as it does not interfere with training or

testing activities. Training activities sometimes disturb ground forms and vegetation in areas visible from these roads. Other areas are disturbed in some locations by burning and fire control measures such as firebreaks, as well as by maintenance of roads and training facilities.

Views from Mission San Antonio de Padua are considered sensitive, and training exercises and vehicle movement are restricted near the Mission. Military convoys avoid use of Tank, Mission Creek, and Del Venturi roads on Sundays, and helicopters or other aircraft are prohibited over the Mission unless approved by Range Control. All military field training in that portion of the cantonment area, west of Silo and Sulphur Springs roads, is prohibited except for light infantry, which is restricted to the west side of the San Antonio River, south of Grid Line 86 (US Army Corps of Engineers 2000b).

### Public Use and Enjoyment

Under current management practices, visitor use at Fort Hunter Liggett is narrowly limited. Public access is usually permitted in the cantonment area and along Jolon and Nacimiento-Fergusson roads (including access to the Tidball Store). The Mission San Antonio de Padua is open to visitation and offers religious services. Visitors have the opportunity to explore the buildings, gardens, and cemetery. A museum fills a string of rooms behind an arched arcade that forms one side of the garden.

The Hacienda provides overnight accommodations and includes a main suite, mini-suite, four tower rooms (suites with queen-size beds), 2 garden rooms, and 3 cowboy rooms with shared baths. Guests can relax in the Milpitas Hacienda bar, which showcases a restored hunting mural and fireplace. Patrons include Milpitas Hacienda serves casual lunches and dinners and is open daily. The restaurant is visited by Milpitas Hacienda guests, employees at Fort Hunter Liggett, military personnel, and visitors to the Mission. While no comprehensive visitation numbers exist, it is estimated that at least 22,000 people visit the Mission and Milpitas Hacienda area annually for a variety of purposes, and approximately 6,000 hunters and anglers for a minimum of 28,000 annual visitors. Most overnight visitors to the Milpitas Hacienda are Army personnel and their dependents. Another 15% of the overnight visitors are indirectly related to military (retirees and Department of Defense).

Hunting is the primary outdoor recreation use at Fort Hunter Liggett. Public access to training areas is limited to people with permits for hunting or fishing. Estimates of hunting and fishing use include 9,500 visitors in 2001 and 5,500 visitors in 2002. Use dropped significantly from previous years due to changes in the security measures as a result of terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. It is estimated that use will remain at current levels for several years.

Fort Hunter Liggett has one campground located in the cantonment area west of Mission Road. The campground consists of an improved section with 24 camping sites and two

toilets. It is primarily used by hunters. The campground store is currently non-operational (US Army Reserve Training Center, Fort Hunter Liggett, 2003). One- and two- bedroom rental units and recreational vehicle and tent camping with full hook-ups are available at nearby Lake San Antonio.

Visitors can drive through the installation and over the ridge to Big Sur via Nacimiento-Fergusson Road. Leaving the valley, Nacimiento-Fergusson Road meanders west over the Santa Lucia Mountains and through the Los Padres National Forest toward California Highway 1 and the Big Sur coast. Its winding route passes through live oak forests and meadows, and it takes more than an hour to navigate seventeen miles. As the road passes its 4,000-foot crest and descends toward the Pacific Ocean, the coast appears below.

The Milpitas Hacienda may interest some Hearst Castle® visitors. Between 1999 and 2001 the number of annual visitors at Hearst Castle® varied from 767,818 to 839,858.

The growing wine industry may bring more visitors to the area if Jolon Road is developed as a wine corridor, a proposal included in the 2004 Draft Monterey County General Plan. Under this proposal the Jolon Road corridor would be allowed a certain number of commercial wine facilities that would be open to the public. Such visitors may be interested in the Milpitas Hacienda, Mission San Antonio de Padua, or the Jolon town site as these resources could be featured as visitor sites along the wine corridor.

## **Traffic and Circulation**

### **REGIONAL ACCESS**

Fort Hunter Liggett is situated approximately halfway between the Pacific Coast Highway (Highway 1) to the west and US Highway 101 to the east. Major regional north-south circulation in the vicinity of Fort Hunter Liggett is via Highway 101. Primary access is via Jolon Road (County Road G14), connecting with Highway 101 near King City, and secondarily via Nacimiento-Fergusson Road originating at Highway 1 near the town of Lucia. Access from the south is via Lockwood Road (County Road G18), connecting with Highway 101 near Bradley. Milpitas Road has provided access to the northwestern portion, connecting with Arroyo Seco Road/Carmel Valley Road (County Road G16) but this route is no longer passable.

Jolon Road is a two-lane road that extends north east to Highway 101 near King City and southeast from the town of Jolon to Lockwood and US Highway 101. The speed limit on Jolon Road is 55 mph. The two-lane Nacimiento-Fergusson Road extends from Mission Creek Road west through the installation, then over the mountain to Highway 1. There is no posted speed limit for most of the road, and travel speeds are generally limited by road conditions (US Army Corps of Engineers, 2000b).

### **LOCAL ROADS**

The primary road network associated with the BRAC excess property includes Mission Creek Road, Infantry Road, and Alamo

Road. Mission Creek Road and Infantry Road connect the cantonment area with more remote portions of Fort Hunter Liggett. With few exceptions, Fort Hunter Liggett roads outside the cantonment area are limited to public access and require a permit for entry (US Army Corps of Engineers, 2000b).

### **LEVEL OF SERVICE**

Level of service (LOS) is a widely used system of describing traffic and driving characteristics at different intensities of traffic flow and congestion. LOS A indicates light traffic, and average travel speed of about 90% of free flow speed. LOS B indicates moderate traffic. Average travel speeds drop due to intersection delay and inter-vehicle conflicts, but remain at 70% of free flow speed. LOS C signifies substantial traffic, longer queues at signals result in average travel speeds of about 50% of free flow speeds. LOS D is heavy traffic. Average travel slows down to 40% of free flow speed. Delays at intersections may become extensive. LOS E indicates very heavy traffic and unstable traffic flows. LOS F signifies saturated flow conditions, forced flow, and low operating speed.

Monterey County considers LOS "D" or better to be acceptable roadway operating conditions. Based on daily volumes and capacities, Mission Creek Road and Infantry Road operated at LOS "A" in 1991; 2,720 vehicles per day were counted in 1995. Jolon Road operated at LOS "A" and "B" in 1995. Highest volume was recorded at the section of Jolon Road between San Lucas Road and US 101, at 6,900 per day, equal to .575 volume-to-capacity, with an LOS "B" rating (US Army Corps of Engineers, 2000b). The Monterey County General Plan Update (2004 Draft) reports the LOS of Jolon Road between Pine Canyon Road (Lockwood) and US 101 to be a "C" rating.

The growth of the wine industry in Monterey County in recent years has led to a county proposal to establish winery corridors. The 2004 Monterey County General Plan (Draft) proposed three winery corridors for the County, one of which is Jolon Road. This designation, if implemented, could result in increased traffic on Jolon Road.

### **Air Quality**

The portion of Monterey County in which Fort Hunter Liggett is located is in attainment with all federal ambient air quality standards. However, this area has been designated as being in non-attainment for the state 1-hour ozone standard and the state 24-hour inhalable particulate matter standard. For more details on air quality standards, see section 4-3 of *Environmental Assessment for the Disposal and Reuse of the BRAC Property at Fort Hunter Liggett*, US Army Corps of Engineers, September 2000.

Existing air emission sources on Fort Hunter Liggett are generated by various testing and training activities. Tracked and wheeled vehicles within the training areas generate localized inhalable particulate matter, and are the primary sources of airborne dust at Fort Hunter Liggett. Fuel combustion during training and testing activities is a source of carbon monoxide,

ozone precursors, and some inhalable particulate matter. Aircraft operations also create a minor source of emissions at Fort Hunter Liggett. Other air emission sources include controlled burning activities and emissions associated with obscurant uses such as smoke screens (US Army Corps of Engineers 2000b).

### Noise

Major noise sources at Fort Hunter Liggett include on-station training activities and traffic on local roadways. Off site noise sources include vehicular traffic and recreational activities associated with the San Antonio Reservoir. Areas with high noise levels and major noise sources on Fort Hunter Liggett include: Schoonover airstrip and other landing zones; Tusi Army Heliport; Multi-Purpose Range Complex (MPRC); and the B-9 Gunnery Range. The Milpitas Hacienda and the Mission San Antonio de Padua are considered noise-sensitive land uses. Sensitive noise receptors have been installed to monitor the impacts of noise on sensitive land uses (US Army Corps of Engineers 2000b).

Blast noise from the MPRC creates the greatest noise impacts associated with current activities at Fort Hunter Liggett. Military vehicles operating on paved and unpaved roadways are a minor source of noise in the area, with impacts confined mostly to areas adjacent to paved roads and tank trails. Individual vehicles will typically produce short-term noise levels to 65 to 70 decibels (dB) at a distance of 50 feet from the roadway. Average noise exposure over a 24-hour period can be represented as a day-night average noise level (Ldn). Day-night sound levels in different areas vary over a range of 50 dB, and every 10 dB represents a doubling of perceived sound level. Levels occur as low as Ldn= 30 to 40 dB in wilderness areas and as high as Ldn= 85 to 90 dB in urban areas. Monterey County has set an Ldn range of 50 to 55 dB as the desirable noise limit for low density residential land uses, with an Ldn of 50 dB as the desirable limit for passively used open space areas.

Short-term monitoring was conducted at several locations at Fort Hunter Liggett on February 26, 1988. Daytime background noise levels were 40 dBA at most locations, with background noise levels of 42 dBA in the cantonment area. Day-night average noise ratings measure perception of sound over longer periods of time than typically spent by a visitor to a park. Depending on training activities occurring at the time of visit, significantly louder noise levels could potentially be encountered at Fort Hunter Liggett (US Army Corps of Engineers, 2000b).

### Hazardous and Toxic Materials

#### CERCLA-RELATED SUBSTANCES

An Installation Restoration Program (IRP) was initiated at Fort Hunter Liggett in 1983. An IRP provides for the inventory of hazardous material sites and necessary remedial actions on federal facilities as required by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). Since the initiation of an IRP, the Office of Environmental Compliance within the Fort Hunter Liggett Public

Works Directorate has coordinated investigations and remediation activities on 34 sites throughout the installation. The sites include former underground storage tank locations, former hazardous waste accumulation areas, spill areas, former waste treatment plants, former fire training burn areas, a battery acid neutralization pit, the former base landfill, and firing ranges. Through fiscal year 2000, the Army completed remedial actions on 30 of 34 inventoried sites. The remaining four sites are the Fort Hunter Liggett Landfill #1, the former pesticide storage building, the motor pool facility, and the fuel depot. None of the 34 sites investigated, are located within the BRAC property.

#### ASBESTOS AND LEAD PAINT

The only hazardous materials known to be associated with the BRAC excess properties are asbestos and lead paint. A survey conducted in 1991 confirmed asbestos containing materials in the Milpitas Hacienda (pipe insulation, floor tile mastic), the Gil Adobe (transite sewer pipe), and Building 127 (HVAC system, floor tile mastic, roofing materials/ mastic). Although not confirmed, the Army inventory has assumed that there is asbestos-containing material in Building 131 based on its estimated construction dates (1910-1929).

No comprehensive lead-based paint surveys have been conducted at Fort Hunter Liggett although lead-based paint tests have been conducted for buildings 124, 127, and 149. Results indicated that buildings 124 and 127 contain lead-based paint. Other buildings that were built prior to 1978 may contain lead paint. This would include the Gil Adobe, the Milpitas Hacienda, the chicken coop (131) and Building 127.

#### Unexploded Ordnance (UXO)

In the course of implementing the 1995 BRAC decision for Fort Hunter Liggett, a preliminary investigation of unexploded ordnance was undertaken by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Historic research and interviews with individuals associated with Fort Hunter Liggett regarding Ordnance and Explosive and Chemical Warfare Materials in use at the installation and on potential BRAC property were conducted by the US Army Corps of Engineers, St. Louis District. The research and interviews were compiled in *Archives Search Report Findings, BRAC Parcels, Fort Hunter Liggett* (September 1999). There is no UXO associated with the BRAC excess property.

#### Public Health and Safety

##### PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

This section describes the baseline conditions of existing public utilities infrastructure systems at Fort Hunter Liggett including the potable water, sanitary wastewater, solid waste, electricity, telecommunications, and propane.

Fort Hunter Liggett obtains all cantonment area domestic water from two local groundwater basins, the San Antonio Basin and the Jolon-Lockwood Basin. Because groundwater is most abundant in deposits of alluvial materials or porous rock, the eastern portion of

Fort Hunter Liggett has larger supplies of groundwater than the mountainous Monterey Formation in the west.

The Jolon fault runs parallel to the east of the San Antonio River. This fault separates the Lockwood Groundwater Basin to the east from the San Antonio Basin to the west, and prevents mixing of the waters of the two basins. The San Antonio Basin is estimated to have usable groundwater storage of 35,000 acre-feet, whereas the Lockwood Basin could contain 250,000 acre-feet of usable water (US Army Corps of Engineers 1995).

A hydrologic assessment of the availability of groundwater in the Fort Hunter Liggett area was conducted for the Army in 1984. The groundwater assessment tentatively determined that the Mission San Antonio Basin has an annual safe yield of 10,000 acre-feet (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 1989). Total Fort Hunter Liggett well water consumption averages between 300 and 350 acre-feet per year. The Mission San Antonio Basin consists of approximately 6,000 acres and is nearly totally contained within the Fort Hunter Liggett boundaries. The Jolon-Lockwood Basin consists of over 12,000 acres. Most of this basin is outside Fort Hunter Liggett boundaries. The total non-Army use of this basin is estimated between 50 and 100 acre-feet per year (US Army Corps of Engineers 1995).

Groundwater quality at Fort Hunter Liggett is considered generally good, although supporting data are limited. Groundwater quality varies according to location and depth. A 1980 study indicated that Fort Hunter Liggett groundwater had low levels of chlorides, nitrates, iron, and magnesium, but that it was slightly alkaline (average pH of 7.6) and prone to hardness, particularly near Sulphur Springs. A water quality analysis by the Fort Hunter Liggett Department of Public Works in 1988 indicates that groundwater hardness, alkalinity, and mineral content have changed very little, if at all, since the earlier study (US Army Corps of Engineers 2000b).

Fort Hunter Liggett's cantonment area is supplied with domestic water by three supply wells drawing from the Mission-San Antonio Basin and the Jolon-Lockwood Basin. The wells are located outside the BRAC excess property. Two are located south of the Jolon town site and one is located one mile south of the North Cantonment Geographic area. The water supply is chlorinated prior to distribution and is tested quarterly (US Army Corps of Engineers 1989). The Jolon area, containing the Gil Adobe and other outlying structures are served by individual wells of unknown condition.

The water system improvements installed in the late 1980s and early 1990s included a fire flow capability with hydrants throughout the cantonment area. The storage and distribution system was designed for an installation population of 4,900 persons and 81,000 gallons per day for irrigation.

The main cantonment area is served by a gravity sewer system, consisting of over 16,000 linear feet of sanitary sewer line ranging from 4 to 18 inches, and an oxidation lagoon sewer

treatment plant. The sewer lines range in age and condition from the vitrified clay lines constructed in the 1930s for the Hacienda to new lines installed during the construction of the Spanish Oaks and Milpitas family housing areas. The oxidation lagoons were constructed in 1972, and are located in the southeast portion of the cantonment area, outside the BRAC excess property, between Mission Road and the San Antonio River. The lagoons have a design capacity of 1 million gallons per day. As recently as 1995, sewage flows averaged less than 10% of the design capacity. During the wet season, sewer infiltration and storm drain connections significantly increase flows. Secondary treatment effluent is disinfected and pumped from the oxidation ponds to a spray irrigation site approximately two-thirds of a mile east of the sewer treatment plant. The irrigation site is fenced to impede public contact.

The Jolon area, containing the Gil Adobe, and other outlying areas, including the Tidball Store have previously been serviced by on-site sewerage disposal systems. The condition or characteristics of the systems serving the referenced excess property is unknown, but presumed to not meet current standards, requiring either connection to the existing system or possible installation of a new onsite disposal system. Future use of the excess property is expected to influence viable sewerage disposal options.

Solid waste at Fort Hunter Liggett is collected by the Pacific Valley Disposal Company, a private contractor. Prior to collection, non-hazardous solid wastes are accumulated at the Fort Hunter Liggett Transfer Facility on Nacimiento-Fergusson Road. The transfer station is not on, or immediately adjacent to, BRAC property.

The Army owns the electrical system within Fort Hunter Liggett boundaries. Fort Hunter Liggett contains 182,634 linear feet of overhead service line, 181,838 linear feet of underground lines, and 120 transformers. Gasoline generators provide backup power. In 1994, approximately 90 percent of the power transmission lines at Fort Hunter Liggett were upgraded. Electrical demand at Fort Hunter Liggett in 1990 was 12,463,512 kilowatt hours (kWh). In 1998, electrical demand was 8,465,467 kWh (US Army Corps of Engineers, 2000b).

The telecommunications system at Fort Hunter Liggett is owned and operated by the Army. Recent upgrades include the installation of fiber optic network connections in 2000. The system includes a three-position, 1,000-line, all-dial switchboard on retained Army property. A combination of above and below ground lines connects individual buildings and some remote training area stations with the switch. Pay telephones are connected to the Fort Hunter Liggett signal frame and then to the Pacific Bell commercial system at King City (US Army Corps of Engineers, 2000b).

Heating equipment at Fort Hunter Liggett uses propane gas provided by an area distributor. A propane tank typically serves each building, however a single tank serves all 57 units within the Milpitas housing area including Javelin Court.

**FIRE, LAW ENFORCEMENT AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES**

Fires at Fort Hunter Liggett are caused by natural occurrence, training or other human activity, and controlled burns. Fort Hunter Liggett operates its own fire department, a full structural fire rescue and natural resources firefighting unit. As of April 1999, the Fort Hunter Liggett fire station employed 25 full-time firefighters, of whom 24 were trained as emergency medical technicians (EMTs) and 10 were certified in hazardous material and waste safety training.

The Fort Hunter Liggett Fire Department also operates under the Natural Resources Fire Prevention Program. The program includes methods to reduce fuel loads at Fort Hunter Liggett through controlled burning and prescribed burning. Controlled burning of ranges and firing sites helps reduce the overall fuel load of areas commonly used for live-fire exercises. Prescribed burning for chaparral management occurs regularly at Fort Hunter Liggett. The Fort Hunter Liggett Fire Department has adopted a controlled burn plan to detail how often and how much is burned at Fort Hunter Liggett. Because military training occurring in the summer has the potential to ignite summer wildfires, Fort Hunter Liggett conducts annual control burns each spring/summer, when fires can be kept cooler and more controlled than wildfires. These controlled burns are primarily in grasslands and savannas within an area of nearly 30,000 acres where military units use pyrotechnic devices as part of training (Clark 2000). Fires are also used to reduce star thistle, break up even-aged stands of chaparral to improve wildlife habitat, and reduce cattail stands at reservoirs. Firebreaks have been established along portions of the installation boundary and within the installation to help keep fires ignited on Fort Hunter Liggett from escaping onto adjacent land and to impede the spread of wildfire and provide access for firefighting equipment. Existing firebreaks are routinely maintained, and new firebreaks are occasionally cleared in emergencies for suppression of wildfire.

Fort Hunter Liggett has mutual aid agreements with Los Padres National Forest and California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection to outline responsibilities and procedures for fire emergencies at Fort Hunter Liggett. Agencies that have automatic aid agreements with Fort Hunter Liggett are Camp Roberts Military Installation in San Luis Obispo and the South Monterey County Fire Protection District. Air quality permits for controlled burns are coordinated with the air resources control board (US Army Corps of Engineers 1995). The Los Padres National Forest has located a fire-fighting unit at Fort Hunter Liggett, and is using installation housing for their expanded wildland fire suppression crews.

Fort Hunter Liggett has a civilian federal police force of 23 officers. The federal police station is located in the cantonment area. Three officers are EMTs and are also certified in hazardous material and waste safety. At least three officers must be on duty during each 12-hour shift.

The installation's Health Clinic has been closed since 1998. Fort Hunter Liggett relies on its fire department for EMT services. The closest 24-hour emergency care facility is the George L. Mee Memorial Hospital 22 miles away in King City.

**Regional Economy****SURROUNDING LAND USES**

The installation is abutted to the west and north by the Los Padres National Forest and on the east and south by private agricultural land. The U.S. Forest Service (USFS) manages Los Padres National Forest lands according to the Los Padres Land and Resource Management Plan (USFS 1988). Also managed by the USFS is the Ventana Wilderness Area, an area of ruggedly beautiful coastal mountains, which straddles the Santa Lucia Mountains south of the Monterey Peninsula. Non-federal land uses surrounding Fort Hunter Liggett are regulated by the Monterey County General Plan and the San Luis Obispo County General Plan. Agricultural zoning (or other low-density uses) is the major land use designation for these areas. The nearby Lake San Antonio recreational area is managed for public use by Monterey County Parks Department.

The nearest population area is Lockwood (population less than 1,000), approximately 6 miles east of the main gate. King City (population of 11,000) is the nearest incorporated city, approximately 23 miles to the northeast. Salinas is the largest nearby population center with 143,776 persons, 36% of the County population (Monterey County 2004). Camp Roberts, the closest neighboring military installation, is 29 miles to the southeast. Camp Roberts is connected to Fort Hunter Liggett by a tank trail maintained by Fort Hunter Liggett.

**LOCAL ECONOMY**

Between 1990 and 2002, Monterey County's population increased from 364,000 to 409,600. A projected population increase to 591,000 by 2020 would represent an increase of 44% over the current population (California Employment Development Department 2002). The civilian labor force for Monterey County in 2001 was 195,800, with an unemployment rate of 9.3%. The state's unemployment rate for the same year was 5.3%. Approximately 40% of county jobs are in the agriculture and tourism sectors. Wages in these two sectors are significantly lower than in other industries. Over 90% of these employees are in the lowest income bracket (\$14,000 to \$30,000) (Monterey County 2004).

Agriculture accounts for 22.9% of total employment countywide. In 1999, agriculture was a \$2.5 billion industry in Monterey County. The services division accounts for 22% of employment, and government makes up over 18% of total employment. Projections for Monterey County's future nonfarm wage and salary employment estimate most growth will occur in services, retail trade, and government. The service industry is expected to add 7,000 jobs by 2006. Retail trade is expected to add 2,900 jobs. Since 1995, Monterey County has recorded continuous growth in total nonfarm employment. Cumulative growth from 1995 to 1999 was 16.4%. In 1999, Monterey County showed 4.9% growth in the non-farm sector, compared to the statewide average of 2.8% (California Employment Development Department 2002).

The largest employers in nearby King City are associated with the agricultural industry – vegetable dehydration, vegetable growing and shipping, wine grape production, and grain and bean processing. Additionally, there are a growing number of local wineries and vineyards.

The budgets of the local government jurisdictions of the cities of King City, Jolon, Paso Robles, Soledad, and Salinas, as well as Monterey and San Luis Obispo counties, are affected by the presence of Fort Hunter Liggett. Costs to these jurisdictions are incurred by the use of educational and other services by Fort Hunter Liggett residents. Federal aid is provided to local schools to offset property taxes that would have been paid by residents living on federal property. Fort Hunter Liggett provides an economic stimulus to the local economy by contracting for construction projects and maintenance at the installation, by providing housing to installation personnel, and through military and civilian personnel and their dependents patronizing local businesses. Fort Hunter Liggett's total operating budget for fiscal year 2001 was \$24,559,400 (Department of the Army 2001).

### Environmental Justice

Presidential Executive Order 12898 requires federal actions to address environmental justice in minority and low-income populations. The intent of the executive order is to avoid any disproportionate adverse environmental, human health or economic impacts from federal policies and actions on minority and low-income populations.

According to 2000 US Census Data, 47% of Monterey County's population is Hispanic or Latino, 40% is White, 6% is Asian, 4% is African American, and the remaining 3% are Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, multi-race or other non-specified race (California Department of Finance 2004). In King City, 66.7% of the population is Hispanic or Latino, 31.1% is White, 0.9% is Asian, 0.6% is African American and 0.7% is other non-specified race (King City 2003).

The 1999 median family income in Monterey County is \$48,305. In King City the median family income is lower because a large percentage of jobs are in the agricultural, manufacturing, and retail sectors. In 2000, the median family income in King City is \$34,398. Monterey County defines very low income as 50% of the median household income. Based on this standard, approximately 45% of King City's population is very low income when compared to the county-wide median income. When compared to the King City median income, over 20% of the households have very low income. In 2000, low income households in King County could not afford to buy a single-family home, but could afford the majority of apartment rentals in King City (King City Housing Element 2003; Monterey County 2004).

## Environmental Consequences

### Environmental Consequences of Alternative A: No-Action

Under this alternative, the Army would retain the BRAC excess property until transfer to another agency occurs. During this interim period the Army is not authorized to expend funds on the BRAC excess property. The interim use period has been in effect for the BRAC excess property since July 2001, when the Army's authority to spend funds on these areas expired. Because the day to day costs of operating the Milpitas Hacienda and the ranch bungalows are covered by leasing arrangements, these structures have remained in use during this interim period. Structures without interim funding sources are not in use (e.g. Gil Adobe). It is not known how long the interim period will continue before the properties are transferred to another agency.

For future property disposal, the Army would eventually pursue one of the options outlined in the Army's *Environmental Assessment for the Disposal and Reuse of the BRAC Property at Fort Hunter Liggett* or would take other action, at their discretion. The Army environmental assessment includes two options that do not involve the National Park Service: a no-action option and an encumbered disposal option. Because it is unknown when future transfer would take place or which agency or organization the properties would be transferred to, the following analysis of the no-action alternative assesses the impacts of continued Army management during the interim period. The analysis assumes that under the No-Action Alternative, with the exception of the Milpitas Hacienda, management of the historic properties for public use would not occur due to constraints in financing for maintenance and operation. The impacts of transfer and management of the BRAC property for public use are analyzed under Alternative B.

#### CULTURAL RESOURCES

**Historic structures.** During the interim use period, the Milpitas Hacienda would continue to be under lease and concession arrangements for lodging and food service. The ability of the Army to maintain the Milpitas Hacienda would be limited by policies which prohibit expenditures of funds on excess property. The concessioner would be responsible for maintenance that is essential to the current use and operation of the Milpitas Hacienda. Recommendations made in the Historic Preservation Plan to lessen the visual intrusions on the historic fabric and to protect the architectural integrity through enhancement would not be implemented. The Army would continue to lease out the ranch bungalows for housing. The Gil Adobe would continue to remain boarded up. No major investment would be made towards its stabilization or restoration.

If the interim period continues for an extended length of time, there would be no funding available for major repair or rehabilitation of the structures. This would result in indirect minor to major adverse impacts on the historic structures. Intensity of

the impacts would depend on the nature of the damage (e.g. damage from natural disasters or fire versus day-to-day wear).

No direct impacts on the structures are anticipated assuming that there would be no modification or demolition of historic properties. However, deterioration of historic properties from lessened maintenance-levels during interim use could result in long-term indirect adverse effects to the integrity of the structures. Limited protection of the historic setting could result in minor to moderate adverse impacts on the Milpitas Hacienda and the ranch bungalows. Adverse indirect impacts on the Gil Adobe from continued deterioration could be minor to major depending on the length of time that the structure remains boarded up. Given the controlled access at Fort Hunter Liggett it is unlikely that vandalism or overuse would have an impact on resources. Public education and interpretation of cultural resources would continue to be minimal resulting in an inability to expand the public's awareness of the historical significance of the historic properties.

**Archeological resources.** No direct environmental effects on archeological resources at the Tidball Store land, the Gil Adobe and Milpitas Hacienda would be expected under interim use period because there would be no ground-disturbing activities on the properties. Fort Hunter Liggett would continue to consult with their cultural resource management staff to avoid or mitigate impacts during training activities.

#### **VISUAL RESOURCES**

Declining maintenance during the interim use period could have adverse impacts on the appearance of buildings and grounds. For example, fencing was recently installed along Hacienda Hill for security purposes. Minor to moderate adverse effects on the visual quality of the immediate setting of the historic properties could be expected during the interim use period.

During the interim use period, the Gil Adobe would remain boarded and draped with tarps. Further deterioration could result in additional adverse impacts on the surrounding visual resources. Such impacts could be minor to moderate depending on the length of time the structure remains unstabilized and in interim status. No impacts are expected for the Tidball Store land, although if the county-owned structure continues to be unused, impacts on the appearance may result from the lack of maintenance. Continued use of Javelin Court for housing would not impact visual resources at Fort Hunter Liggett.

#### **PUBLIC USE AND ENJOYMENT**

Under interim use status, public use and enjoyment of the excess properties would be limited to the Milpitas Hacienda. Without additional visitor programs or services, visitation would remain at levels similar to current use. If interim use continues for an extended period of time, minor to moderate adverse impacts on public use and enjoyment would be expected due to lack of funding for repair or rehabilitation.

#### **TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION**

Changes in traffic and circulation on Fort Hunter Liggett are not expected under interim use. No direct or indirect effects on traffic and circulation are anticipated.

#### **AIR QUALITY**

Air emissions associated with the BRAC excess property are expected to remain the same during interim use. No direct or indirect impacts on air quality are anticipated.

#### **NOISE**

Noise levels at the BRAC excess property are not expected to change during interim use. No direct or indirect effects on noise are anticipated.

#### **HAZARDOUS AND TOXIC MATERIALS**

Removal and remediation of asbestos and lead-based paint found in the Milpitas Hacienda, the historic ranch buildings, and the Gil Adobe would not take place. No direct or indirect impacts would be expected (US Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District 2000b).

#### **PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY**

**Public Utilities.** Access to public utilities would remain the same under interim use status.

#### **Fire, Law Enforcement and Emergency Medical Services.**

Interim use status would have no direct effects on public services. The Fort Hunter Liggett fire station and police station would continue to respond to emergencies at the BRAC excess property (US Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District 2000b).

#### **REGIONAL ECONOMY**

The number of employees at Fort Hunter Liggett not be affected by the interim use status. Services provided at the Milpitas Hacienda (restaurant, bar, overnight lodging) would continue during this time. The Javelin Court housing area would continue to house Fort Hunter Liggett employees at 95% occupancy. No direct effects on the regional economy are expected during interim use.

#### **CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

Adverse cumulative impacts on the historic structures may occur over time. Impacts from the vibrations of tank maneuvers and low-flying aircrafts could over time have a minor to major adverse impact on the physical integrity of the historic structures. Deferred maintenance due to lack of funding for major repairs and rehabilitation would result in further deterioration of the historic structures over time.

#### **Environmental Consequences of Alternative B: An Addition to Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument and Designation as an Affiliated Area of the National Park System**

#### **CULTURAL RESOURCES**

**Historic Structures:** The transfer, lease, or sale of historic property out of Federal ownership without adequate and legally enforceable restrictions or conditions is generally considered to

have an adverse effect on that property (36 CFR 800.5 [a] [2] [vii]). Under this alternative, preservation covenants and protective easements would be included in the real estate documents to mitigate such adverse effects.

As a new component of Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument and an affiliated area of the National Park Service, new resources would be available to protect the architectural integrity of the Milpitas Hacienda and to address the visual intrusions on the historic ranch fabric. California State Park professionals with historic preservation expertise would be charged with ensuring the long-term protection of the resource. Interpretation and education of the Milpitas Hacienda and the ranch bungalows in the context of the historic ranch and the San Simeon estate would be a significant part of California State Parks management and operations, creating greater public awareness of the historical importance of these resources.

Under Alternative B, the Milpitas Hacienda would also be considered for addition to the San Simeon Estate National Historic Landmark. As a contributing component to the national historic landmark, the Milpitas Hacienda would receive additional recognition and would be managed under the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation. Management of the Milpitas Hacienda and the ranch bungalows by California State Parks, national recognition of the Milpitas Hacienda and technical assistance from the National Park Service would create major direct beneficial impacts on the Milpitas Hacienda and the ranch bungalows in the long term.

Alternative B includes the potential for collaboration with the Monterey Diocese to assist in the curation of artifacts and the management of visitors to the Mission San Antonio de Padua. Such collaboration would have minor to major long term beneficial impacts on structures and artifacts at the Mission San Antonio de Padua.

Transfer of the Gil Adobe to a local agency and management through a non-profit entity for historic preservation would have direct beneficial long term impacts. Coordinated management and interpretation of the Jolon town site would greatly increase public awareness of Jolon's role in Monterey County history and would have a long-term beneficial impact on historic properties not included in this study such as the Tidball Store structure, the Dutton Hotel ruin, and St. Luke's Episcopal Church.

Increased visitor contact with historic structures could potentially result in damage through normal wear-and-tear and through vandalism. Impacts could be mitigated through visitor management programs, and regular maintenance by park personnel. Increased education and interpretation could reduce damage and vandalism through increasing appreciation and awareness of the resources.

**Archeological Resources.** Modifications to the landscape surrounding the structures to accommodate increased public access could result in direct adverse impacts on archeological

resources. The level of impacts would depend on the location and siting of facilities for public access or new building uses. As with the historic structures, the potential for vandalism might increase. However, these impacts would likely be mitigated through visitor management. Additional research and documentation of archeological resources at the BRAC excess properties would have a long term indirect beneficial impact.

#### **VISUAL RESOURCES**

Under this alternative, minor disturbance in the vicinity of the transferred structures may occur to accommodate facilities for better public access. It is assumed that such modifications would be designed to avoid impacts on the historic setting. The structures' exteriors would be adequately preserved.

Management of the Milpitas Hacienda and ranch bungalows by California State Parks would emphasize preservation of the historic setting and surrounding visual quality. California State Parks, with technical assistance from the National Park Service, could work to remove current impacts on the visual quality of historic setting. Because this could only apply to the BRAC excess properties that are transferred, this action would have a minor to moderate beneficial impact.

Under this alternative, the Gil Adobe could be stabilized or restored by a non-profit organization and managed as part of a larger effort to interpret and preserve the Jolon town site including the Tidball Store and the one-acre of land that will be transferred. This would have a minor to moderate long-term beneficial impact on visual resources of the Jolon area.

#### **PUBLIC USE AND ENJOYMENT**

Addition to Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument and designation as an affiliated area of the national park system would provide greater opportunities for public use and enjoyment at Fort Hunter Liggett. California State Parks, with technical assistance from the National Park Service, would create additional opportunities to interpret the history of the Milpitas Hacienda in association with William Randolph Hearst's historic estate and architect Julia Morgan. Public use and enjoyment would be increased by exhibits, displays, and personal communication.

The Mission San Antonio de Padua has expressed interest in working with California State Parks and the National Park Service to manage visitors to the Mission and to assist in artifact curation. Interpretation of the Mission San Antonio de Padua could enhance the experience of visitors to the Milpitas Hacienda. California State Parks may also find it possible to undertake some interpretation of other aspects of Fort Hunter Liggett, including both its military history and its significant natural history.

With a California State Park presence and National Park Service affiliated area designation, annual visitation could increase by 10,000 visitors per year to the cantonment area per year. This projection is derived from baseline figures on overnight lodging and food service and beverages at the Milpitas Hacienda, visits to the Mission, and analysis of visitation of similarly situated NPS

units. In ten or more years, once visitor programs in connection with Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument (Hearst Castle) are established, visitation could reach 50,000–75,000 as the Milpitas Hacienda provides an interpretive experience not currently available at the Hearst Castle. Visitors at the Milpitas Hacienda can spend the night and dine in a building used by William Randolph Hearst and designed by Julia Morgan.

Currently, only visitors who can afford to stay overnight at the Milpitas Hacienda have an opportunity to enjoy the building interiors aside from the lounge and the restaurant. With additional interpretive programs provided by California State Parks, there may be lower cost day use opportunities for lower-income populations to learn about the history of the Milpitas Hacienda and other history aspects of Fort Hunter Liggett.

Under this alternative, it is assumed that the historic properties at Jolon would be managed by a local agency or non-profit entity. Visitor interpretation, which is currently limited to two plaques, would be improved and if feasible, the Gil Adobe could be restored for public use and interpretation. Public amenities located off of Jolon Road at the Tidball Store could attract visitors from the Milpitas Hacienda, and visitors from the rapidly growing Salinas Valley wine industry. In addition, the recent opening of the National Steinbeck Center in Salinas may attract visitors to Jolon. Jolon in the Gold Rush era was featured as the setting in one of Steinbeck's novels. Overall, Alternative B would provide for moderate direct beneficial impacts on public use and enjoyment opportunities in Monterey County.

#### **TRAFFIC AND CIRCULATION**

Approximately 10,000 additional visitors (an estimated 3,500 vehicles, based on 2.8 persons per vehicle) would be expected to be attracted to the installation annually in the near term. With future development of the Jolon Road "wine corridor" and increased marketing and visitor programs by California State Parks, vehicle numbers would increase. Because a portion of future visitors would be expected to arrive in buses, vehicle numbers may be considerably lower than the 2.8 persons per vehicle estimate for 50,000 to 75,000 visitors (8,000-26,000 vehicles annually). Additional cars and buses have the potential to contribute to traffic and circulation on the installation and on local roads. However, when this annual volume of recreational traffic is compared to the daily volume of 2,720 vehicles on Mission Creek Road (nearly 1 million vehicles annually) it becomes apparent that visitors will constitute a minor increment to the overall daily traffic volume (US Army Corps of Engineers 2000b).

To a large extent, recreational visitation associated with this alternative would be expected to occur more on weekend days, at a time when traffic associated with installation operations would be at a relatively low level. Consequently, even if operations and related traffic at Fort Hunter Liggett were to increase, direct adverse impacts on traffic and circulation would be minor.

It is assumed that Javelin Court will continue to function as

housing and operate at the current occupancy rate of 95%. Rental units on the open market could attract residents who work outside the installation. Given that there is a demand for housing by employees at Fort Hunter Liggett, this change in tenancy would provide for negligible to minor impacts on traffic and circulation.

#### **AIR QUALITY**

Air quality concerns in the area include both inhalable particulates and pollutants associated with combustion, including ozone. The additional visitation expected at the site should not affect inhalable particulates, since access roads to the areas of historical interest are paved and visitors would not be expected to generate dust. However, air quality could be affected by vehicle emissions from the additional visitors attracted to the historic structures. Initially, the estimated increase of an additional 3,500 vehicles annually would constitute a minor increment to the base's operational traffic, contributing negligible increments of hydrocarbon pollutants. Increased visitation over time could cause additional adverse effects on air quality. It is noted that much of the visitor traffic would occur on weekends, at a time when commuter traffic is light and there is less likelihood of approaching or exceeding threshold pollution levels. Visitors may also arrive via buses which would reduce the amount of air pollution associated with additional vehicles.

Public transportation is currently not available to Fort Hunter Liggett. The remote location of Fort Hunter Liggett would require most visitors to travel long distances via automobile (over twenty-five miles) to access the historic structures. This could have a minor adverse effect on regional air quality. Overall, Alternative B would have minor adverse impacts on air quality.

It is assumed that Javelin Court will continue to function as housing and operate at the current occupancy rate of 95%. Rental units on the open market could attract residents who work outside the installation. Given that there is a demand for housing by employees at Fort Hunter Liggett, this change in tenancy would likely contribute to negligible to minor impacts on air quality.

#### **NOISE**

Management of the historic properties for visitor use would generate additional noise as more cars and buses would be traversing through Fort Hunter Liggett. This increase in noise would cause direct effects on ambient noise. Such impacts would be negligible to minor relative to the noise levels currently generated by training activities.

#### **HAZARDOUS AND TOXIC MATERIALS**

As in Alternative A, no direct or indirect impacts on public health and safety would be expected. The results of any previous asbestos investigations and surveys would be provided to California State Parks. Army regulations do not require that asbestos-containing material be remediated in buildings prior to transfer. However, the Army is required to abate any asbestos-containing material that does not comply with applicable laws, regulations or standards or that poses a threat to human health.

According to the Army's *Environmental Assessment for the Disposal and Reuse of the BRAC Property at Fort Hunter Liggett*, lead in soils would be investigated with other potentially contaminated sites. Some residential units have been inspected for lead-based paint and lead-based paint hazards. Inspection and survey results and descriptions of abatement measures taken would be provided by the Army to California State Parks. Consistent with the Residential Lead-based Paint Hazard Reduction Act of 1992 (P.L. 102-550), the Army would provide notice in transfer documents that buildings containing lead-based paint would be restricted from residential use unless the recipient of the property abates any hazards.

Lead paint removal or remediation has the potential to slow development of the property for public use. This could have a moderate impact on future reuse of the property. In the long term, funding may be available for lead paint or asbestos abatement, particularly if restoration work were to commence. Such abatement action would have a minor to moderate beneficial impact.

#### **PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY**

**Public Utilities.** Increased visitation to the historic properties would create increased demand on public utilities. The initial increase in visitors could be up to 10,000 annually and could possibly reach up to 50,000 to 75,000 in the long term as California State Parks incorporates the Milpitas Hacienda and the ranch bungalows into its operation at Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument. Assuming that annual visitation eventually reaches 75,000 (primarily day-use), consumptive demands on the water system would amount to less than an acre-foot per year, constituting a minor increment to water use on the installation, which is generally between 300 and 350 acre-feet per year. This minor increment of water demand would not result in overdraft of the aquifer which supplies water for the installation.

There are no new development projects or new land uses associated with this alternative that would result in an increase in discharge of either sediment or chemical/biological pollutants to either surface water bodies or to groundwater. According to design capacities documented in the Army's *Environmental Assessment for the Disposal and Reuse of the BRAC Property at Fort Hunter Liggett*, wastewater would be adequately treated by the existing plant, which operates with a substantial surplus capacity. Electrical and propane systems would similarly have more than enough surplus capacity to accommodate short and long-term increases in visitation. As in Alternative A, the occupancy rates at Javelin Court would likely stay the same (95%) and would not impact existing utility systems. Overall, adverse impacts on public utilities would be negligible.

#### **Fire, Law Enforcement and Emergency Medical Services.**

Increased visitation and use of the historic properties may result in impacts on public services. Transfer to a state agency could result in increased response times if public services are provided by

agencies and hospitals in King City. These impacts would be mitigated by the establishment of a mutual assistance agreement between the receiving agencies and the Army. California State Parks would enter into an agreement with the Fort Hunter Liggett fire station and police station to respond emergencies at the excess properties (US Army Corps of Engineers, 2000b). This service would be on per call basis for initial response. California State Parks could contract with the Monterey County Sheriff's office to conduct follow-up investigations to police incidents. In the long term, California State Parks may have its own law enforcement presence at Fort Hunter Liggett as the potential to develop a training facility for California State Parks law enforcement facilities at Fort Hunter Liggett is under discussion. Local agencies or non-profit entities managing the Jolon area properties would likely enter into a mutual assistance agreement to provide emergency services for visitors. If arrangements are made with Fort Hunter Liggett to provide initial emergency response services, impacts to response times at the Milpitas Hacienda and the Jolon area would be negligible.

#### **REGIONAL ECONOMY**

This alternative would increase the number of recreational visitors to Fort Hunter Liggett by approximately 10,000 visitors per year, with the potential to reach 50,000 to 75,000 in the long term. These visitors would contribute to the local economy by purchasing various goods and services, including food, gasoline, and lodging. To the extent that such expenditures are recycled in the local economy, a multiplier effect would occur. The Javelin Court housing area would continue to function as housing and operate at the current occupancy rate of 95%. Contributions to the local economy by residents at the Javelin Court housing area would not change under this alternative. Overall, minor to moderate, direct and indirect beneficial impacts on the local economy would be expected.

#### **CUMULATIVE IMPACTS SUMMARY**

As discussed above, the additional recreational traffic stimulated by creation of a unit of the California State Park System would contribute to air pollution in the area, although it is expected to be a minor contributor. The remote location of Fort Hunter Liggett would require most visitors to travel long distances via automobile (over twenty-five miles) to access the historic structures. Over time, increased visitation by automobile may contribute minor cumulative impacts on the regional air quality.

Alternative B would result in long term enhanced resource protection and preservation of the historic properties. Cumulative impacts from increased visitation over time could result in some amount of deterioration of historic structures or disturbance to archeological resources. Management of the properties with historic preservation and cultural resource protection as a main objective would ensure that these impacts are prevented to the greatest degree possible. Additional resources for cultural resource management would contribute towards the maintenance and upkeep of the historic structures and would mitigate against visitor impacts.