

# CWC RESPONSES TO CHWP MASTER PLAN

(September 28, 2015)

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF CLAREMONT WILDLANDS CONSERVANCY POSITIONS:**

CWC has worked with the City of Claremont staff and consultants throughout the process of developing the Master Plan. Fuller explanation of our positions can be found in the body of this document.

### **Here are some of our main points of agreement, which we encourage you to support:**

- The three primary goals: preserve the park as an environmental resource, manage the park for passive recreational use, and minimize negative impacts on neighbors; seek balance among these factors.
- The guiding principles including preservation, stewardship, access, education and public engagement.
- The definition of the park's carrying capacity, recognizing that current use levels do not damage the park and are socially acceptable to park visitors; acknowledgment of the need to reduce congestion on adjacent streets and negative impact on neighbors.
- The proposal to increase the numbers, hours, responsibilities, and enforcement powers of rangers.
- The emphasis on developing a healthy park culture with a strong educational component, and the proposal to make effective use of volunteers under the guidance of a staff member.
- The recommendations on ways to prevent wildfires.

### **We believe the following aspects of the Master Plan need strengthening:**

- CHWP is an asset. The plan should **stress positive aspects** of the large number of visitors: they do no significant damage to the park; their parking fees help support park costs; the regional draw helps Claremont win grants for the park; they are future advocates for preservation of open space; and they are potential customers for Claremont businesses.
- CWC urges a stronger, broader **vision** to guide park management and decision-making for 20+ years. This includes a stronger commitment to **expansion** of the park across all of Claremont's hillsides as a "desired outcome" along with coordination with neighboring communities to contribute to a larger continuous regional open space.
- The Master Plan states that CHWP, unlike all other city parks, must be financially self-supporting for the next 20+ years. While primary **funding** may come from parking fees, we should not tie the hands of future City Councils.
- CWC supports including a **governance plan** -- a well-defined organizational structure for CHWP management and decision-making with a citizens advisory committee made up of various stakeholders to monitor implementation of the plan and ensure public input. We believe that up-to-date **empirical data** are necessary to inform decision-making, especially regarding parking decisions.

### **CWC opposes the following specific recommendations in the draft Master Plan:**

- **Changing the name** to "Claremont Hills Wilderness Area." CHWP operates as part of the Claremont Park system; it doesn't meet the criteria of a "Wilderness Area"; and this is a waste of \$10K.
- **Maintaining current park hours.** CWC proposes adding 30 minutes to the park's open hours in March and October to match dusk; the change results in an additional 30 hours of visitor use per year.
- **Locking the entrance gate** one hour before closing time; we propose no more than 30 minutes
- **Raising parking fees** (daily from \$3 to \$5 and annual from \$100 to \$140). We propose leaving these fees at the current levels, which are more in line with comparable parks. The proposed increases may have negative consequences: driving visitors away, which results in decreased revenues; providing

incentives for visitors to park on streets or use other park entrances, which may cause negative impacts on neighbors.

- **Instituting a \$10 congestion-price parking fee** during peak periods (Sat. and Sun. mornings) when the current lots are full. We strongly oppose, as it discriminates against low-income visitors and is likely to have the negative consequences noted above. A better solution is to provide adequate overflow parking in spaces adjacent to the current lots for peak periods.

## **Introduction:**

We appreciate the City's commitment to a Master Plan for the hillsides and the immensity of the task it has undertaken. We are impressed by the amount of information that the City staff and consultants have compiled and analyzed, and the time and effort they have invested in producing the draft. We appreciate their willingness to listen to community members in the process. And we are impressed by the overall tone and the consideration of concerns of a range of stakeholders with different perspectives.

The draft, overall, focuses on the main issues that should be addressed—preservation, access, safety, park culture (including education) and sustainable funding. It proposes sound recommendations for managing the park's resources and offers generally solid proposals for park maintenance. It is centered, as it should be, on the concept of balance: balancing preservation and recreation.

While we have a number of suggestions for strengthening the draft, we are in agreement with the majority of its recommendations. For example, we strongly support:

- the three primary goals and most of the desired outcomes and guiding principles presented in chapter 1 (section 1.2.2) and elsewhere throughout the document (pages 4-2 and 4-3; section 5.2.3);
- the definition of the park's carrying capacity (section 2.2.4);
- the proposal to increase the numbers, hours and responsibilities of rangers, including their enforcement powers (section 5.2.7);
- the emphasis on developing a healthy park culture with a strong educational component, and multiple ways of building it (for example, sections 5.2.8, 5.2.10, and 5.2.21);
- the recommendations on ways to prevent wildfires (5.2.24); and
- the proposal to make effective use of volunteers under the guidance of a staff member (5.2.10).

In the spirit of striving for balance in the document, we would like to see greater emphasis on the positive values of the park and the benefits of the large number of visitors. The park should be seen as a rich opportunity, not a problem to be solved. Some positive values include:

- enhancing visitors' joy and good health. For example, responses on the visitor surveys were strongly positive, expressing joy and love of the park. A summary of them should be included, along with reports of "what detracts from an enjoyable experience" in the last paragraph on p 2-8 of the draft master plan;

- Increasing the likelihood of obtaining state and county grants because of the park’s widespread appeal to high numbers of visitors from the larger community, including the underserved, who are often the segments of the population targeted by funding agencies.
- creating many present and future advocates for the conservation of nature;
- increasing revenues for managing the park (through fees paid by these visitors)
- providing a greater number of potential customers for local businesses; and
- promoting stewardship

Stewardship, the second guiding principle (pp. 1-6, 4-2, 5-3), ought to emphasize the constructive role that park visitors could play in taking care of the park and fostering the culture of mutual respect noted throughout the plan. As drafted, the plan’s definition of stewardship as a guiding principle emphasizes professional management (e.g., “professional industry standards”) and narrows the role of park “users” (as opposed to park “visitors”) to what they will *not* do (e.g., “shall not negatively impact wildlife and surrounding properties,” pp. 1-6, 4-2, 5-3). A definition of *stewardship* that begins by including park visitors as being among the CHWP’s stewards could be linked to specific points of the Implementation Plan (Chapter 5), including, for example, sections 5.2.8 (Enhance Programming and Public Outreach, p. 5-7) and 5.2.10 (Create a “Friends of the CHWP”, p. 5-8). Put another way, Stewardship and Public Engagement, the sixth guiding principle, overlap. Along these lines, public outreach should inform park visitors that revenues from the fees they pay are necessary to support the maintenance of the park.

We sense some additional imbalances in the lists of "desired outcomes" and "guiding principles" (chapter 1 and elsewhere throughout the document but first expressed on pp. 1-5 and 1-6). Among the outcomes, #3 (redistribute hours of use), and #4 (increase visitor management) seem to be at a different level from the others. For example, redistributing hours is a minor point in relation to the other outcomes and seems like a means to the end of #2 (reducing neighborhood impacts) or #5 (enhancing visitor experience), rather than being an end in itself. And isn’t increasing visitor management (an unclear expression) a means for #1 (increasing stewardship of natural resources) and #2 (reducing neighborhood impacts)? Similarly, the fourth Guiding Principle, “Trail network” (p. 1-6) is not a principle *per se* but rather reiterates the desire to protect natural habitats and watershed drainages, provide public access, and protect the overall environment—concepts which are already included in the first three guiding principles.

Notably absent from this list is the City’s commitment to expanding the park as a means of establishing and preserving an open-space corridor through the San Gabriel foothills (as described in the CWC’s February 2015 Position Statement for the CHWP Master Plan, under “Preservation: Expanding the Park,” pp. 2, 4).

### **Our Three Major Recommendations:**

**1) Vision:** Since the plan is intended to be in effect for twenty years, it needs a broad, long-term vision that should include at least the following elements:

- A vision of a grand, cohesive wilderness park that encompasses and preserves Claremont’s hillsides from one end of the City’s sphere of influence to the other. Why is this not a primary

goal (1.2), or at least a “desired outcome” (1.2.1)? The vision requires a much stronger expression of the City’s commitment to expanding the park than the one in the draft (p 5-5). It involves anticipating challenges and recommending adequate processes and resources for funding and managing new acquisitions. Furthermore, it involves having not only a current vision, but also one for the mid and long term. For instance, if west-side parcels become part of the park, what guidelines—or process for developing guidelines—will determine access and parking, facilities for park visitors, management of multiple types of users, and ways to balance competing types of trail use?

- A vision of the park as a contributor to regional open space. This vision could be one of an extensive open-space area with a cohesive plan for balancing access and preservation, with robust volunteer and educational elements and with multiple access points throughout the entire system that are easily available to all. It involves building a strong network with neighboring communities and governments to expand and maintain an extensive open-space corridor. It involves coordination across city boundaries on initiatives of preservation and access, of watershed and wildlife protection, and of trail design and maintenance. It involves coordinating policies and operations with the National Forest Service, particularly regarding management of the adjacent San Gabriel Mountains National Monument and continuing to work for a more comprehensive National Recreation Area in the future.

**2) Sustainable Funding:** With the acquisition of the CHWP Claremont gained a valuable asset that not only provides the benefits of open space but that increases the value of adjacent property and enhances Claremont as a city. The City of Claremont accepted funds from county and state agencies to acquire much of the land and in doing so also must accept financial responsibility for maintaining the park. It is irresponsible to expect park visitors to shoulder the entire cost. The city pays the bulk of the costs of other parks, why shouldn’t the City at least contribute something to the costs of the CHWP? Currently the estimated total operating cost is less than 1% of the annual city budget.

Instead, the draft master plan precludes expenditure from the General Fund for the management of the park. Language on page 1-5 calls for the provision of “sustainable funding to support park management, operations, and maintenance.” This is a worthy outcome if the vision for what is to be sustained is not cramped. But language on page 5-5 under the *Implementation Plan* expresses more concern about Wilderness Park funds not encroaching on the City’s General Fund budget for the next twenty years than it does on bringing to life a vision of what the park could become. The language in the draft is tied to the present, where City funds are tightly constrained. However, by banning any expenditure of General Funds for park management and expansion for twenty years, it does not allow for flexibility. Instead, it ties the hands of future City Council members, who may have the resources and the will to supplement park revenues with General Fund monies in order to acquire a hillside parcel or remove an invasive species or repair an eroded slope.

In addition, except for the park rangers, the current language on funding does not consider the cost of the City’s staff time and efforts to manage and expand the park. Who will hire, supervise, and coordinate the rangers? Who will write grants to implement the Resource Management Plan? Who will take the initiative to lay the groundwork with property owners and negotiate with Trust for Public Land and with county and state governmental agencies for the purchase of parcels for the park?

Furthermore, surveys of park, parking and neighborhood conditions should be ongoing and the results used to inform decision-making. The budget should include appropriate funds to support ongoing surveys and data analysis. To achieve the desired outcomes, the Master Plan needs to address, realistically and explicitly, the need for adequate staff time, clear allocation of responsibilities, and sufficient funding in support of the above.

**3) Park Governance:** The Master Plan should outline a clear mechanism for how the park will be governed, i.e. how decisions will be made and how progress will be monitored. It should explicitly state who will be responsible for creating appropriate plans of action, securing funding if necessary and answering questions like the following: What are the priorities for the next steps in implementing the resource management plan? What is the plan for improving trails? What is the best alternative for vegetation management to deter fire? How shall the CHWP be managed to protect the watershed? What are the best sources for grants to implement recommendations in the resource management plan? Who is in charge of acquiring additional hillside parcels, and with what resources?

Section 5.2.10 in the draft, "Create a 'Friends of CHWP,'" on page 5-8 states, "Oversight function will be provided by the existing advisory structure of the Parks, Hillside and Utility Committee and the Community and Human Services Commission." The oversight powers are appropriate, as is the proposal to create a Friends committee. However, since the City's commission and subcommittee have such a broad scope of responsibilities, it is unlikely that they will attend to detailed needs in the CHWP and there is no mention of a specific staff role except for the rangers. To whom do they report? The plan is in need of focus from specific City Staff along with appropriate funding for that role.

Since the Community Services and Human Services staffs are responsible for the care of the Wilderness Park, they would benefit greatly from routine and structured input from those who have day-to-day experience with what is happening there—those who have good insight into the state of the trails, the range of invasive species, and problems of any kind as they arise.

The best way to assure that this feedback is provided in a useful and ongoing way is to form a standing consulting committee or advisory group that meets regularly, perhaps only three or four times a year, with the director of Community Services and/or Human Services. (Committees that meet "as needed" tend to fade away.) In addition to regular reports from rangers on park conditions, a system could be established for other committee members to report urgent news to the committee director(s) or to the senior park ranger, as needed, between meetings. The committee would then propose to the Parks, Hillside, and Utility Committee and to the Community and Human Services Commission plans of action based on information that is more likely to be current, accurate, and comprehensive.

Members of the committee could include park visitors with current active experience, rangers (or the senior park ranger speaking for all rangers), other relevant City staff members, current TAC members who wish to continue, and community experts such as environmental studies professors and RSABG researchers.

## **Specific responses to recommendations in Chap 5 - Implementation Plan:**

### **We support the following recommendations:**

- 5.2.6 - All future acquisitions are automatically folded into the CHWP:** A good idea. Would the CHCC have responsibility over the entire CHWP, or only the original Pomona portion?
- 5.2.7 - Increase staffing:** Strongly support. This would establish one full-time plus five part-time positions (an increase of three) in addition to maintaining volunteer rangers. We recommend adding language assigning responsibility for ranger participation on the standing consulting committee described above.
- 5.2.8 - Enhance programming and public outreach -** Strongly support
- 5.2.9 - Relocate existing kiosks:** Generally support. It would be good to have citizen and ranger input into what information to include. We also like the idea of a more substantial kiosk so that rangers, docents or volunteer greeters would have a shady place to sit.
- 5.2.10 - Create a "Friends of the CHWP":** Strongly approve. We need to consider the various functions that might be served by this group and how they relate to the overall governance structure.
- 5.2.12 - Maintain Red Flag Emergency Closure Policy:** It has been suggested that we could use push media to inform regular users (e.g. annual permit holders or others who have registered with City) of park closures.
- 5.2.14 - No Parking on south end of Via Padova:** This seems wise, and we support staff working with LA County to regulate it.
- 5.2.19 - Install two composting toilets:** These should be strategically located on the loop on stable, flat sites and, if possible, near places where "informal latrines" have developed. The presence of informal latrine sites in Johnson's Pasture suggests that perhaps a toilet should be provided there as well.
- 5.2.20 - Pursue easements for access from Pomello:** It would be good to establish legal access at this site and provide clear signage to direct visitors across the berm, as currently in use.
- 5.2.21 - Signage Program:** We support the signage program as described, i.e. consistent in materials and style, strategically and discretely placed, appropriate to the wilderness setting, and avoiding excessive "sign pollution". We like the idea of public input (i.e. collaboration between rangers and the Friends group), but are concerned about the vagueness of the timing, i.e. "as signs are replaced within the park". We understand that the cost of doing everything in the first year is prohibitive, but recommend at least establishing a schedule for phased implementation. We should also explore the possibility of outside funding for the signage program, or perhaps consider a bridge loan so that new signs can be installed in a timely and coordinated way. An interesting proposal is to develop a smart phone app which

could provide information about geology, biota, and cultural history keyed to GPS coordinates.

**5.2.22 - Integrate informal trail network:** We agree with the general approach of closing some unauthorized trails (i.e. badly eroded trails or those in conflict with environmental regulations) repairing or rerouting others as needed, and integrating them into the overall trail network for management purposes. We also support the long-term vision of developing new single-track hiking trails (e.g. Sycamore Canyon) in order to provide access to additional regions of the park.

As written, this section is general and lacks detail about which particular trails are to be closed, rerouted, repaired, or integrated. It would be helpful to establish a clear process by which such decisions will be made. (See our general comments on governance above)

**5.2.23 - Update Vegetation Management Plan:** Seems like a wise idea. Specifics should be spelled out so that responsibilities of City and the LA County Fire Department are clear.

**5.2.24 - Develop a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP):** Seems obvious and wise.

**5.2.25 - Implementation Review:** We agree with the importance of regularly monitoring the implementation of the Master Plan, and of making needed modifications and adjustments if necessary. This section could be strengthened by clearly specifying who has the responsibility to oversee the process (see general comments under governance above). There may be a need to adjust the timing of implementation of particular activities or to make changes due to changing conditions in the park or adjacent neighborhoods and these changes should be based on consultation with a standing consulting or advisory committee with representatives from all stakeholders.

**We are neutral on the following recommendations:**

**5.2.13 - Implement a specific CHWP Neighborhood RPP policy for Mills entrance:** Because the mission of CWC relates to the CHWP, we have chosen to remain neutral on the recommendation of RPP zones in Claremont; however, as with other issues, we strongly believe that any decisions should be based on analysis of current data.

**5.2.18 - Install spike strips at the exits of the north parking lot:** We understand the benefit in terms of restricting access to the lot at night, but are aware of critics who feel that it may appear too unfriendly or too urban.

**We oppose the following recommendations:**

**5.2.5 - Rename the park the Claremont Hills Wilderness Area (CHWA):** We strongly oppose this change. Since implementation of the 1964 Wilderness Act, the term "Wilderness Area" is defined specifically in ways that do not apply to the Claremont Hills Wilderness Park. As

defined in the Wilderness Act, such areas specifically exclude roads (permanent or temporary), use of motor vehicles and other forms of mechanical transport, and structures. All of these are features in the Claremont Hills Wilderness Park. By contrast, the term “Wilderness Park” does not have a comparable official definition. CHWP is a part of Claremont's park system, and when modified by “wilderness,” the term “park” is an accurate and appropriate name for this hillsides asset. Furthermore, the \$10,000 budgeted to rename the CHWP could be better spent implementing other elements of the master plan.

Beyond the proposal to formally rename the park, the draft uses “wilderness area” and “open space” interchangeably, which is inaccurate and potentially misleading. Use of the term “wilderness area” in the Master Plan (for example, on pages 1-1, 1-5, 4-3, 4-5, 4-7, 5-2, and 5-5 of the draft) should be edited to avoid this language in favor of more accurate alternatives (such as “open space” or “natural area”).

**5.2.11 - Maintain current hours of operation:** We agree with the general approach of specifying fixed hours that approximate dawn and dusk. In order to more closely meet this standard, the closing times in March and October need to be set 1/2 hour later. This will provide visitors with 30 more hours/year of time in the park, and it will make it easier to enforce the hours, since people resist leaving while it is still daylight.

**5.2.15 - Modify parking permit fees:** We strongly oppose the proposal to raise the annual permit fee to \$140. The draft master plan justifies an increased permit fee based on review of parking permit fees at “other regionally drawing parks” (p. 5-11). However, the examples of other annual fees (included in Attachment 5H) are not comparable and are actually misleading: Eleven of the twelve annual fee comparisons listed in Attachment 5H are for permits that provide access to *entire park systems* (e.g., the California State Parks and the regional park systems of San Bernardino, Los Angeles, and Orange Counties). The lone exception to this—Martin Tudor Jurupa Hills Regional Park in Fontana—charges no fees. (See Appendix A, below.) The annual fee for the Claremont Hills Wilderness Park does not provide access to any other parks or park systems. The annual permit fee should not be raised.

In fact, we suggest that an annual permit fee even lower than the current one of \$100 be considered to encourage visitors to use the parking lots and to provide more predictable income. In order to be successful, these permits must be easily available through Internet purchase and at the park entrance. Permits should be available for both six-month and one-year periods. Regular users would be likely to purchase an annual permit if it were affordable and easily available.

The draft master plan would also raise the daily fee from \$3 to \$5 for a four-hour permit. We do not support an increase in the daily parking fee. An increase might raise more revenue, but it might also drive some visitors away, lead them to seek other park entrances, or cause them to park further away on city streets and walk through neighborhoods—all negative unintended consequences.



Visitors should be made aware that daily and annual fees provide financial support for the amenities of the CHWP. The number of visitors, annual pass holders and daily fee purchasers should be monitored and open for adjustment using an effective mechanism for consultation and review as described under governance.

**5.2.16 - Implement congestion pricing program** - We strongly oppose this proposal to charge \$10 for parking on Saturday and Sunday mornings. It discriminates against those whose work schedules permit them to visit the park only on weekend mornings, as well as those less economically advantaged. It is apt to have the unintended consequence of driving people to seek other park entrances or to park further away on city streets, thus having a greater negative impact on the neighbors. It will most likely lead to cars lining up at the gate, idling and waiting for the 10:00 a.m. entry at the lower fee.

The trade-off of free access from 12:00-4:00 p.m. on Sundays and Mondays is not a satisfactory compensation for two reasons: it is the hottest part of the day during summer months, and it is likely to conflict with work hours. According to the draft, the CHWP is not at full capacity, but because the current parking lots are insufficient on weekend mornings, the number of visitors using nearby streets is having a negative impact on neighbors. In addition, the City of Claremont is losing potential income from parking fees.

We strongly recommend an alternative solution to congestion pricing that will solve these problems. We propose providing adequate overflow parking for use during peak periods by expanding the current lots. To contain costs, the added areas should be graded but not paved, should use best environmental practices, and should be gated so that space is available only as needed. The PVPA land adjacent to the north lot might be explored, as well as land to the east of the south lot (by the power lines, along Mt. Baldy Road).

**5.2.17 - Install timed entrance gate with emergency exit at main entry:** We can see the benefit in terms of restricting entry when the park is closed, allowing egress at all times, monitoring visitor numbers, and sparing the rangers from having to close the gates. However, we are sensitive to the concerns of some that this may project an urban, Disneyland-like image rather than being in tune with our natural wilderness setting. If it is to be installed, we urge that the design of the gate be sensitive to the setting. However, given the cost of the gate, we question whether it is the wisest use of city funds.

It does not make sense to lock the entrance gate a full hour prior to park closing hours. Many people do not walk the entire loop and wish to take a short walk at the end of the day, and bikers can easily complete the loop in one hour as well as can some runners. The entrance gate should be closed no more than 15 to 30 minutes prior to the closure of the park.

**Summary:** In conclusion, the CWC Board of Directors recommends that a stronger and more aspirational **vision** for the CHWP be developed to guide all decision-making and management for the foreseeable future. This park is a valuable asset that enhances quality of life and property values. It brings people to Claremont to shop and dine. It provides an opportunity to develop current and future

advocates for open space and helps encourage their understanding of land stewardship. The vision should include **expansion** of the park to preserve our local hillsides and contribute to a larger regional open space with multiple access points, in coordination with the San Gabriel Mountains National Monument, National Forest Service and potentially a National Recreation Area. This vision also supports a balance between environmental preservation and recreational access through a robust program of public outreach, education, and volunteer service. Sufficient **sustainable funding** should be made available to support the operation the of the Park and the implementation of the Master Plan, and sources of funds should remain flexible, including outside grants and the General Fund.

Finally, the Master Plan should provide general guidelines and mechanisms for decision-making over the next 20+ years. However, the current draft focuses heavily on immediate needs. Chapter 5 lists several specific recommendations for implementation during the first year, but we should also think in terms of phased proposals for mid- and long-range improvements. New conditions and challenges will inevitably arise in the future, and today's decisions about specific park hours, the cost of parking fees, and the adequacy of parking spaces may not fit tomorrow's needs. The Master Plan should include an effective **governance** structure in order to specify how decisions will be made in response to such changes. Future challenges will be best addressed through the combined efforts of City Staff and members of the community, including representatives of all stakeholders. In agreement with the Guiding Principle of "Public Engagement" (see p 1-6 of the Master Plan) we recommend the establishment of an official advisory group or consulting committee to work with City Staff on decisions pertaining to CHWP operation.

We feel strongly that up-to-date empirical data are necessary to inform decision-making based on facts and not on assumptions. For example, monitoring numbers of annual pass holders and daily fee purchasers could inform decisions about how fees should be set to generate maximum revenue. Similarly, up-to-date visitor counts and a survey of peak-period demands could help to reach an appropriate solution for weekend usage conflicts.

We offer these recommendations in the hope that they will help strengthen and improve the draft Master Plan so that it can indeed serve as a "guiding document for at least twenty years, sufficiently flexible to remain relevant and evolve with changing conditions yet firm in its commitment to the original goals" (p 1-4 of the draft).

## Appendix A.

Bonelli Regional Park	\$140	Also provides access to: Castaic Lake Recreation Area, Kenneth Hahn State Recreation Area, Peter F Schabarum Regional Park, Santa Fe Dam Recreational Area and Whittier Narrows Recreation Area.
Chino Hills State Park	\$195	This is for the annual permit fee for access to <i>all</i> California State Parks
Glen Helen	\$190	Part of the San Bernardino Co. park system—annual fee provides access to <i>all</i> SB Co. parks.
Jurupa Hills Regional Park	\$0	No fee
Mojave Narrows	\$190	Part of the San Bernardino Co. park system—annual fee provides access to <i>all</i> SB Co. parks.
National Forests	\$30	The Adventure Pass: This too allows access to multiple venues. The Adventure Pass has also been subject to significant legal challenge (e.g., <a href="http://www.latimes.com/science/sciencenow/la-sci-sn-forest-service-adventure-pass-20140430-story.html">http://www.latimes.com/science/sciencenow/la-sci-sn-forest-service-adventure-pass-20140430-story.html</a> )
Orange County Regional Parks	\$55	This annual permit provides access to <i>all</i> Orange Co. regional and wilderness parks.
Prado Regional Park	\$190	Part of the San Bernardino Co. park system—annual fee provides access to <i>all</i> SB Co. parks.
San Bernardino County Areas	\$190	Includes Glen Helen, Mojave Narrows, and Prado (all listed separately) as well as additional parks in the SB Co. system.
Santa Fe Dam	\$125	Part of the California State Parks system.
Whittier Narrows	N/A	Part of the Los Angeles Co. park system.
Yorba Regional Park	\$55	Part of the Orange Co. regional park system.