The Santa Lucia Chapter of the Sierra Club has endorsed the first comprehensive blueprint for conservation of the 83,000-acre Hearst Ranch, which provides in detail the conservation measures that need to be included in any conservation deal.

The plan, called the “Blueprint for the Conservation of Hearst Ranch,” was developed by the Friends of the RanchLand and the Environmental Defense Center (EDC) and has been lauded by two top state officials as well-thought out, reasonable and valuable to the process of reaching agreement on the best way to preserve the Ranch on the central California coast.

At its Executive Committee meeting in June, the Santa Lucia Chapter board adopted the following endorsement of the Blueprint: “Because the conservation of the Hearst Ranch is important, the Santa Lucia Chapter of the Sierra Club endorses the Blueprint for Hearst Ranch Conservation because it is a fine piece of work, it is a wonderful resource, and it provides much needed guidance.”

Chapter Chair Tarren Collins noted: “We would all love to see the ranch preserved. Hearst wouldn’t be at the table today if generations of activists hadn’t been fighting to save this ranch for decades. But we need to remain mindful that this is a business transaction between a corporation and the state of California. Our job is to make sure that corporate profits don’t come at the expense of public benefits.”

“Hearst Ranch and its 83,000 acres of ocean frontage, mountains, forests, streams, lagoons, rare plants and threatened animal species is singular as one of our country’s rare jewels,” she said. “Our goal at the Santa Lucia Chapter of the Sierra Club is to protect and preserve this majestic land for all generations in perpetuity.”

Collins pointed out that the Sierra Club (both the National and the local Santa Lucia Chapter) and the SLO Coast Alliance (a consortium of 33 environmental groups with over 22,000 supporters) have said from the beginning that they couldn’t endorse the Corporation’s current single-page “framework” because its 10 brief bullet points, on a single sheet of paper, don’t give sufficient details to assure protection of the Ranch’s environmental and cultural resources.

For more than six months, the Hearst Corporation and American Land Conservancy have stressed to environmental organizations that their support is critical to obtain funding for the Hearst Ranch framework. Toward that end, Friends of the RanchLand and EDC spent considerable time and money to draft a comprehensive document outlining the essential terms necessary to gain that support.

The Blueprint has also been endorsed by the SLO Coast Alliance, ECOSLO (the Environmental Center of San Luis Obispo County), the SurfRider Foundation, CoastWalk, and other prominent local and statewide environmental groups, and they have applauded Friends of the RanchLand and EDC for preparing this detailed document.

In a marathon session on July 10, the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board rejected a staff recommendation to permit PG&E to continue to use up to 2.5 billion gallons of coastal water daily for cooling its 2,200 megawatt Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant.

The staff had been negotiating with PG&E for more than two years on terms of a mitigation agreement to let PG&E continue to operate after its previous five year operating permit expired in 2000. The permit was continued on administrative extension pending the outcome of negotiations. The end product was a set of three documents, a Consent Judgment, a Conservation Easement, and a permit to operate the plant called a Waste Discharge Requirements Order.

In a peculiar sequence of events, the first two documents were approved by the Board at its March 21 meeting pending later Board approval of the Order at its July 10 meeting. The Consent Judgment called for a dollar payment by PG&E for various measures that totaled $6.25 million, together with the Conservation Easement which would turn over 5.7 shoreline miles and about 2,000 acres of property to the Land Conservancy of San Luis Obispo “in perpetuity.”

We objected to the three agreements on several grounds. The tradeoff did nothing to directly remediate larval mortality at the cooling water intake,
Santa Lucia Chapter Potluck Picnic

12 Noon, Saturday, Aug. 23
Cuesta Park
San Luis Obispo
Contact Sierra Club @ 543-8717

Come and join the Sierra Club for a fun day in the sun at Cuesta Park in San Luis Obispo. This is an opportunity to meet others, have fun and enjoy great food. There will be games, door prizes and maybe a few other surprises along the way. Everybody is invited, so bring your family & friends to this outdoor extravaganza.

The Sierra Club is providing drinks. Please bring your own place setting and a dish to share as listed below. There will be a BBQ available.

- A-I, Main Dish
- J - O, Salad
- P - R, Bread
- S - Z, Dessert

Directions to Cuesta Park: Heading South on Hwy 101—Take the Monterey Street exit. Turn right at the top of the exit ramp. Turn right again on Loomis Street and follow Loomis Street to Cuesta Park. Heading North on Hwy 101—Take the Monterey Street exit. Turn right on Garfield and travel over Hwy 101 to the stop sign. Turn right on Loomis Street and follow it to Cuesta Park.

Do you like to plan parties?! We can use your help with planning and setup. To lend a hand or for more information on the picnic or, call Terri at 543-8717.

California/Nevada Conservation Activists to Gather in SLO

You are invited to join the over 100 conservation activists who will be attending the California/Nevada Regional Conservation Committee (CNRCC) meeting at beautiful Rancho El Chorro near San Luis Obispo on the weekend of September 6-7. The meeting provides an opportunity to network with other conservation activists and to become involved in regional conservation issues ranging from forest and coastal protection to urban environmental challenges, sprawl and water quality. This year’s keynote speaker is Kevin Hall from the Tehiptie Chapter who will be leading off the proceedings with “Cleaning Up The San Joaquin Valley’s Air: An Activist’s Journey.”

This September’s CNRCC program is designed to be very newcomer friendly with special workshops for first-timers and a special travel reimbursement program. “How To Reduce Sprawl In Your Community” and a talk on the Bush Administration’s forest fire reduction (logging) program are among a group of special programs aimed at newcomers. To make it even easier to attend, the CNRCC will waive registration fees for newcomers and will reimburse travel expenses for anyone who needs the help. Registration includes lunch, dinner and lodging on Saturday, September 6 and breakfast September 7. Workshops begin at 10 a.m. Saturday with the main program beginning at 1 p.m. The meeting adjourns at noon on Sunday.

The regional meeting will also include a wide variety of other interesting programs with an update on the Barbara Boxer campaign from her staff and discussion of how to replace the Bush Administration with more environmentally friendly representation. There will also be an update from California State Legislative Staff. Progress continues to be made on a variety of fronts in Sacramento which is much more friendly to environmental legislation than Washington, DC.

Annette Souder, Director of the Sierra Club’s Global Population and Environment Program in Washington, DC, will present a workshop on creating advocacy strategies in Washington, DC, on September 7.

For more information about the September CNRCC meeting, including registration, facilities, and program schedule, contact Lori Ives at <livescl@earthlink.net> or John Monsen at <wildernessjfm@aol.com>. To get regular updates on statewide conservation issues and the work of the CNRCC and Sierra Club California, sign up for the California Activists list serve at <http://www.isl.org/SCRIPTS/WL.EXE?XH=LISTS.SIERRACLUB.ORG>. Click on the eyeball icon to the right of Calif-Activists to sign up.
Opposition to Duke’s Proposed Cooling System Heats Up

by Jack McCurdy

A preliminary decision that would allow Duke Energy to continue withdrawing water from the Morro Bay National Estuary to cool its proposed new power plant and killing marine life has met with an onslaught of criticism from the Santa Lucia Chapter of the Sierra Club, local public agencies and environmental groups. As a result, the California Energy Commission’s Presiding Committee, which has been reviewing the project for more than 18 months, ordered April 7 the submission of additional briefs in response to the strong criticisms that were expressed at a contentious June 30 hearing on the Presiding Members Proposed Decision (PMPD) in Morro Bay. Another hearing may grow out of the decision.

A final decision by the full Commission on a license for the proposed plant is not expected until early next year after the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board decides on an operating permit for the facility. In addition to the Chapter, opposition to the PMPD and support for dry cooling of the plant, which would use no estuary water, was registered by the SLO County Alliance on Plant Expansion (CAPE), a nonprofit citizens group that is an intervenor in the project review; the California Coastal Commission, the California Department of Fish and Game and other environmental groups. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) also has expressed opposition to use of estuary water for a new plant.

Several speakers at the hearing accused the PMPD’s endorsement of the Duke project as being “preordained.” One of those, Pamela Soderbeck, an attorney for CAPE on air quality matters, said these words best describe the PMPD’s overall conclusions: “sophistry, specious reasoning, fallacy, illogical, irrational, unsound.” She called it “an incredible reasoning, fallacy, illogical, irrational, unsound.” She called it “an incredible reasoning, fallacy, illogical, irrational, unsound.”

Proposed Cooling does not establish a legal basis for the Commission, said, “The PMPD letter to the Presiding Committee, shortcoming of the PMPD was alleged to represent a major flaw in the PMPD’s analysis.”

The proposed new plant would be greater at the 370 mgd annual average compared to 475 mgd because “it is well established that larval abundance undergoes huge variations during any given year. The longer the new plant runs at or near maximum output, the more likely it will be to ‘catch’ a period of very high larval abundance while it was using maximum or near maximum cooling water.”

This argument about water use reflects the analysis of the CEC staff, which strongly recommends dry cooling for the new plant.

But even if it were shown that the new plant would divert less water from the Estuary than the existing plant, it did not necessarily follow that fewer larvae would be killed as a result, the Chapter said. That is because “specifying annually averaged daily water consumption is insufficient to characterize entrainment” at either plant. “Entrainment mortality depends significantly on the operating schedule in both cases.”

For example, the existing plant would be much more likely to operate only for what is called “peaking” during summer periods of high demand when competitive efficiency is less important than availability, then shutting down during other months. In contrast, the new plant would be much more likely to operate continuously for many months at a time to provide more efficient and much more competitively-produced baseload power, shutting down only to remain below the 370 mgd annual average maximum promised by Duke.

Hence the new plant is likely to kill more larvae, though its annually averaged water use of 370 mgd is lower than the 387 mgd adopted (as a baseline) for the existing plant.” This represents a major flaw in the PMPD’s reasoning about water use impacts, based on evidence in the record but was ignored.

The Chapter letter rejected the PMPD’s finding that dry cooling is not feasible and too costly for the Morro Bay site, in large part because “all the elements of the (PMPD) analysis—appearance, noise, technical feasibility, compatibility with the site, cost—rely almost completely on information provided by the Applicant, who has a powerful vested interest in rejecting the dry cooling option.” At the same time, the Commission staff, the Coastal Commission and NMFS are independent, objective parties who favor dry cooling but were ignored.

One “straightforward test of feasibility would be to issue a request for proposals for hypothetical design and cost estimates of a dry cooling system at Duke/Morro Bay and see what comes back, as opposed to relying on one Duke consultant’s opinion.”

The Chapter believes “that if the Applicant put its mind to the task, it could install dry cooling at the site which would balance cost, efficiency, capacity, and other environmental factors in exchange for total elimination of the mortality caused by once through cooling. Nothing in this (PMPD) has convinced us otherwise.”

The Chapter also strongly disagreed with the PMPD’s acceptance of a habitat enhancement plan (HEP) as mitigation for entrainment mortality by a new plant while allowing it to continue to use Estuary water because the evidence in the record does not support reliability and effectiveness of a HEP. In other words, a nexus, or link, between a HEP and compensation for entrainment has not been demonstrated by evidence.

This is the crux of the matter. A nexus has not been established, nor has the claim of a sufficient offset for mortality,” the Chapter said.

In addition, Duke proposes and the PMPD accepts use of what is called a “Habitat Equivalency Analysis” to calculate the number of equivalent acres of habitat for purchase and improvement by Duke to offset entrainment loss. Assigning dollar values for such habitat as mitigation “is simplistic,” the Chapter said. Duke simply has not shown that such a plan would replace an equivalent number of the dead larvae resulting from plant operations.

As did CAPE, the Chapter also deplored the PMPD’s “practice of overruling and contradicting its own staff on issue after issue” while supporting Duke and its consultants who testified. “Staff is the most competent, best informed, and only completely objective body involved in the project. It has been at work for years, has not been established, nor has the claim of a sufficient offset for mortality,” the Chapter said.

LUNCH ON OUR PATIO
ENJOY EVENINGS WITH MUSIC
1110 GARDEN ST. SLO
541-5888
Coastal Commission Tries to placate SLO while “Tough Talking” on LCPs

by Mark Massara
Sierra Club Coastal Program director

(Editor's note: Chapter Chair Tarren Collins and Sierra Club member Joan Carter were among the county residents testifying on June 12 in Long Beach in support of Coastal Commission action to force the County of SLO to adopt all 165 recommended amendments to our county's outdated LCP. Collins reports that the Commission indicated that the LCP will be back on its agenda during its August meeting in Huntington Beach. She urges members to attend the hearing in August. For more details about the date for this agenda item, you can check the Commission’s webpage at http://www.coastal.ca.gov in mid July.)

On Thursday, June 12, the Commission tried to bend over backwards to accommodate the willfully renegade County of San Luis Obispo (“SLO”). As CoastWatcher (CW) readers will recall, SLO is the county now famous for spending hundreds of thousands of dollars and years trying to avoid updating their LCP. SLO is the poster child for why LCPs throughout California must be required to be updated by the State Legislature. SLO has thumbed their nose at the Coastal Commission and coastal protection by steadfastly refusing to incorporate some 165 recommended upgrades into their LCP. The question on the Commission’s agenda was whether to send a letter to the State Legislature detailing the miserable San Luis experience.

To recap, in 2001 the Coastal Commission provided SLO with 165 recommendations pertaining to their ancient and virtually useless LCP. Over two years later the County has “tentatively” and “partly” responded to about half, but has either watered down or refused to address nearly every single recommendation designed to improve coastal protection, the whole point of the exercise in the first place.

And SLO is exactly the reason the State Legislature must require that LCPs statewide be updated. No local official working with local developers would ever willingly update an LCP in order to incorporate modern (and stronger) protections for coastal resources. What is happening in SLO is happening statewide. Any person wanting to develop and wanting to avoid using modern and more stringent resource protection policies would naturally seek to delay and avoid updating their LCP. And that is exactly what is going across the state as dozens of LCPs that are more than two decades old grow older and more useless everyday. Instead of guiding local development, LCPs are but an afterthought now, to be amended only when necessary to accommodate ever more development. Can anyone ever recall an LCP being updated to protect the coast? 99.9% of all LCP updates today are project driven.

So the Commission tried to cut SLO some slack, show some flexibility. Instead of writing to the legislature about SLO’s intransigence, the Commission offered to continue to spend time and money working with SLO in order to try to move the LCP forward. The Commission directed its staff to prepare for SLO a list of priority LCP amendments that are crucial to having a valid LCP, such as “don’t grade ESHA” and “don’t grade steep hillsides above creeks.”

What did SLO do? They hired a high-priced lobbyist to try to derail the Commission’s deliberations and they sent combative Supervisor Shirley Bianchi to the meeting to speak for them. Bianchi made a very confusing presentation in which she took credit for saving the coast and maintained that large portions of the SLO coastline are “already saved.” Bianchi included Hearst Ranch and numerous other properties in her maps and discussion that are neither protected nor saved. It was flat out misleading.

Then dozens of concerned citizens from SLO, many who reside in Bianchi’s district and are her constituents, testified as to their concerns regarding the delay and obvious malfeasance plaguing the County Board of Supervisors and planning department. Then Bianchi got back up for rebuttal and said that no rebuttal was necessary because the public testimony revealed “nothing creative, nothing constructive.”

So much for trying to make nice and be flexible. With refreshing candor, Commissioner Iseman said that while she has sympathy for Bianchi and local government, Bianchi’s rude demeanor really concerns and worries her. How can we move forward if we won’t even listen to one another?

Commissioner Wan raised the potential of proceeding along two fronts, by writing to the legislature about the State LCP crisis. Instead of writing to the legislature about San Luis, Reilly advised writing to the legislature about the statewide LCP crises.

With that, the Commission didn’t even vote on the San Luis LCP, but instead directed staff to prioritize the 165 LCP recommendations and to continue to work with SLO on their update.

Next the Commission began to deliberate a resolution to the legislature regarding the need to amend the Coastal Act in order to require that local governments update LCPs. This is a crucially important aspect to protecting coastal resources and a top priority for Sierra Club’s Great Coastal Places Campaign. During an unprecedented series of hearings in front of the Commission in 2002, hundreds of people testified at meetings up and down the state and thousands more attended hearings and wrote letters urging that LCPs be updated as a way to recognize and save the last great coastal places in California.

And with Chairman Reilly urging his fellow Commissioners to support the resolution, the Commission voted 6-2 to send the resolution. The resolution, found at http://www.coastal.ca.gov/lcp/h15.6-2003.pdf states that the Commission urges the Governor and State Legislature to amend the Coastal Act to require that LCPs be updated at least once every ten years, the same as the law for General Plan updates. Failure to update an LCP should have consequences, the Commission resolved, including a prohibition on new amendments and the ability of the Coastal Commission to write the update for the local jurisdiction.

The resolution, as contained in the staff report, passed the Commission on a 6-2 vote (note that the portions of the resolution pertaining to San Luis, found at Section 1(e & f) were deleted).

The most interesting aspect of the Commission discussion regarding LCP updates involved Commissioners Potter and Hart. Potter opposed the resolution because by requiring local governments to update their LCPs, Potter felt the Commission would be creating an unfounded mandate on local government at a time when local budgets are a disaster. Potter was not persuaded by the language in the resolution asking that the legislature require that development fees be used for grants to local government to cover the costs of LCP updates.

Hart opposed the Coastal Commission doing anything whatsoever regarding LCPs and again declared his intent to write to the legislature in dissent.

Sierra Club submitted over 500 written letters from activists across California supporting the resolution, and another two dozen environmental organizations signed onto a group letter supporting the resolution and the mandate that LCPs be updated.

The resolution, along with a cover letter to be drafted by Commission Chair Mike Reilly, will soon be transmitted to the Governor and State Legislative leaders. With any luck, next year activists throughout California will have the opportunity to urge their elected representatives to improve the Coastal Act and require that LCPs be updated.

Diablo

continued from page 1

and the Conservancy would not restore the indigenous marine life at the outfall that had been replaced by non-native species acclimated to higher temperatures, but rather trade it for control over shoreline that was already under voluntary conservation management by PG&E. The so-called permanent easement was vulnerable to unilateral reversion by PG&E under certain conditions. All ongoing biological monitoring would be discontinued.

After nearly ten hours of discussion and testimony by PG&E, Water Board staff and consultants, the Mothers for Peace, the California EarthCorps, and the Santa Lucia chapter (the last three were official parties to the hearing), the Board voted to send the entire package back to staff for further study. Staff were directed to develop a suite of remedial measures that would compensate directly for larval mortality and species displacement, including a marine reserve as one possibility, to look into monitoring both around the plant and in the larger region affected by it, and to advise on administrative measures—fines—as well as reexamining a draft Cease and Desist order that had been shelved since 1999.

We have nothing but praise for the willingness of the Board to listen, analyze, deliberate, and ultimately act in the interest of the coastal environment. Whatever the eventual outcome, we believe it will be a substantial improvement over the mitigation package that was proposed to the Board and rejected.
Hearst Ranch
continued from page 1

Collins explained that no matter what development the Corporation planned for the Ranch in the past, the fact is, current resource limitations and changes in state and federal laws have rendered these plans unbuildable. Ironically, Hearst’s Framework for Hearst Ranch Conservation could result in more actual development than they could get approved now, with the public paying upwards of $100 million for the privilege of accepting the larger project, she said.

The Executive Committee has made clear that the Santa Lucia Chapter will continue striving to make sure that the deal being negotiated with the state, on the public’s behalf, is a good one that all can wholeheartedly support. “Because the devil is in the details, we view the Blueprint for Hearst Ranch Conservation as an invaluable tool to accomplish this goal,” Collins said.

The Blueprint was well received by state officials who will be involved in negotiations on a deal to preserve the Ranch. Sam Schuchat, Executive Officer of the California Coastal Conservancy, said the Conservancy was “most appreciative of the effort that went into preparing the Blueprint,” calling it “a well-considered, well-researched and credible document which fleshed out a number of issues on which we need additional background.” He said the Conservancy is “struggling to get adequate information from the Hearst Corporation.”

Mary Nichols, Secretary of the State Resources Agency, who had requested input from environmental groups on the Hearst framework, indicated during a meeting with us last month that the Blueprint is an excellent working document for the state to refer to in its negotiations with the Hearst Corporation and the American Land Conservancy.

A summary of the Blueprint’s recommendations:
1. Full details of the proposal should be made available to the public for a reasonable comment period before any deal is finalized.
2. The entire Hearst Ranch should be purchased and the fee-title transferred to public ownership.
3. If a conservation easement is purchased instead, it must be guaranteed to be durable and enforceable as well as ensure that any allowed development does not interfere with the conservation values of the Ranch.
4. Any grazing should be conducted using best stewardship and management practices in a manner that does not degrade the range.
5. Any allowed uses should preserve and protect the diversity of habitat types on the Ranch and require restoration of any degraded habitats.
6. Scenic values should be preserved if uses are allowed, critical viewsheds enhanced and development strictly limited. Light pollution should be prohibited or effectively mitigated.
7. Access to the coast should be maximized, including designation of a Coastal Trail segment.
8. Sites and land forms deemed culturally significant by Native American groups must be preserved, restored and respected, and a Cultural Preservation Plan developed, if uses are allowed.
9. Any easement should maintain and preserve sites, routes and other areas of historical significance and public access ensured.
10. Highway 1 should remain a scenic two-lane road, and passing lanes should not be installed unless absolutely necessary for safety, in which case their length should be restricted.
11. Any easement contract should ensure management and oversight of the property and verifiable compliance with easement requirements and conditions.

The entire Blueprint is available at www.slocostalliance.org and www.edcnet.org/ProgramsPages/hearst.htm.

Action Item: Protect Native American Resources in the Coastal Zone

An important piece of legislation, AB 974 (Joe Nation) is working its way through the Legislature. This bill would provide protection for Native American resources in the Coastal Zone.

Currently the Coastal Act does not mention cultural resources or sacred sites and treats other resources, referred to as archeological and palentological resources, as “scientific artifacts”, the fate of which is determined by archeologists, not Native Americans. This bill would change that. It requires that if archeological, palentological and cultural resources are identified in consultation with the Native American Heritage Commission and appropriate local Native Americans, then all feasible measure shall be taken to avoid impacts. Where there is a sacred site, it shall be protected against significant disruption. Thus, these sites and resources would be given the protections they deserve and Native Americans would be a part of the process.

There are more than forty Native American tribes and bands who are in support of this bill, but there is also a list of those who are opposed, including the Building Industry, Board of Realtors, Mining and Forestry.

Dear Assemblymember Nation:

We (I) are (am) writing today to let you know that we are in support of your bill (AB 974) to protect Native American Resources in the Coastal Zone. This bill is needed to correct a major weakness in the Coastal Act and to finally recognize the importance of these resources. It helps to correct the injustice associated with the present law which does not recognize the Native American’s right to be part of the process of determining either the location of sacred sites and cultural resources and their protection or the location and disposition of other resources. We (I) applaud your efforts and strongly support the passage of this excellent piece of legislation.

Sincerely,

Your name and/or organization
Elkhorn Slough Overnight
by Jack Beigle

Elkhorn Slough is located inland from Moss Landing, north of Monterey. It is larger than Morro Bay and its long axis runs inland and not parallel to the coast as Morro Bay Estuary. We camped at Sunset State Beach Friday and launched 9 boats Saturday morning.

The tide was with us as we paddled under the Highway 1 Bridge and headed down wind into the working its way fog as we paddled otters and a pod of stretched out on the sun to warm. We turned left which wandered in a sinuous path as tide was low banks of the creek level. We had an excellent view of the small crabs and other little creatures that lived in the banks, but forward visibility was limited to the next bend. We were paddling through a giant maze with many dead ends. It was a great relief to all when we emerged into the main channel.

We ducked into another creek mouth to get out of the wind and eat lunch. We were thrilled to see a flock of anodes in their bright breeding plumage. They are beautiful! After lunch we paddled on to Kirby Park where we had set up a shuttle to take the car drivers back to Moss Landing. They returned, loaded their boats and avoided the paddle back into the wind. It was a very enjoyable outing.

We camped Saturday night, and Sunday morning we drove south to Monterey. We planned to launch our boats by the Coast Guard Pier, but we found the launching ramp was completely covered with sea lions. They were actually climbing over the mudflats it led us inland. The enough that the were above our eye level. We avoided the paddle back into the wind. It was a very enjoyable outing.

Coastal Trail Expedition 2003 Comes to SLO County

The Coastal Trail Expedition 2003 (CTE 03), a hike along the California coast from the Oregon border to the Mexican border, will travel through San Luis Obispo County the first two weeks of August. Sponsored by Coastwalk, a nonprofit educational organization, the Coastal Conservancy, and California State Parks, CTE 03 began June 3 at the Oregon border and will end September 22. The goal of CTE is to garner support and generate publicity for the California Coastal Trail, a continuous public right-of-way along the California coastline. Approximately 700-800 miles of the projected 1,200-1,300 mile-long Coastal Trail are currently completed and traversable via non-motorized means.

Ten hikers will complete the entire expedition, and others will join for durations of a week or longer. Day hikers are invited and encouraged to join the expedition. They must provide their own transportation, and a $20 donation is requested. Volunteers to cook evening meals, lead hikes, and provide support are also needed. The expedition will be in San Luis Obispo County from August 8 to August 17 at the following locations (mileage is approximate):

- Aug. 8: Salmon Creek to Ragged Point Inn via an inland trail (12 mi.)
- Aug. 9: Ragged Point Inn to south of Piedras Blancas (13 mi.)
- Aug. 10: Layover day at San Simeon State Park
- Aug. 11: South of Piedras Blancas to East-West Ranch in Cambria (14 mi.)
- Aug. 12: Ardhath Road to Villa Creek via Hwy 1 (12 mi.)
- Aug. 13: Villa Creek to Morro Bay Embarcadero (10 mi.)
- Aug. 14: Morro Bay Embarcadero to Montaña de Oro via the Sandspit (10 mi. – day hikers excluded due to boat crossing)
- Aug. 15: Montaña de Oro to Allen Peak, out and back (12 mi. RT)
- Aug. 16: Avila Beach to Oceano (11 mi.)
- Aug. 17: Oceano to Guadalupe State Beach (12 mi.)
- Aug. 18: Guadalupe State Beach to Point Sal, out and back (9 mi.)

For more information or to volunteer, contact SLO County Coordinator Nancy Graves at 473-8506, nancygraves@hotmail.com or Joan Glassy at 924-1408 <jbglassy@earthlink.net>. To volunteer for Coastwalk’s annual hiking/camping trip from August 3-8, contact Sara Mikkelsen at 788-2601 <saramikkels@hotmail.com>. You can track the expedition at http://www.californiacostaltrail.info and learn more about Coastwalk and the California Coastal Trail at http://www.coastwalk.org.
When a good friend’s not enough...
Individual and Couple Counseling
Personal and Business Coaching
in person or by phone
(805) 534-1101
Jill Denton, LMFT
Caroline Hall, MBA
A portion of all fees are donated to non-profit organizations
www.AccessPt.com
Access Point - a place to turn

Get your Trail Guide
today! Only $14.95. We pay tax & shipping!

Name ____________________________
Address __________________________
City, State & Zip __________________________

Make check payable to “Sierra Club Trail Guide” and mail to:
Sierra Club Trail Guide
P.O. Box 15755, San Luis Obispo, CA 93406
Phone orders, call Chapter Office at 543-8717

Law Offices of Jan Howell Marx
A Client-Centered Practice
• Business
• Elder Law
• Environmental Law
• Labor/Employment
• Real Estate
• Wills & Trusts

(10% discount with Sierra Club Bequests)
541-2716
P.O. Box 1445, SLO 93406-1445
E-Mail: janmarx@fix.net

A Will . . .

. . . is a way to protect the environment as well as yourself. If you do not have a will, the state decides how your property and other affairs are handled. Decisions made now can later provide financial security for family, friends, and the Sierra Club. You may even direct your bequest to a specific Club program or your home Chapter.

For more information and confidential assistance, contact
John Calaway
Sierra Club Planned Giving Program
85 Second Street, 2nd Floor, San Francisco, CA 94105-3441
(415) 977-5538.
Outings and Activities Calendar

All of our hikes and activities are open to all club members and the general public. If you have any suggestions for hikes or outdoor activities, questions about the Chapter’s outing policies or would like to be an outings leader, call Outings Leader Gary Felsman (473-3694). For information on a specific outing, please contact the outing leader. Outings Leaders please get your outings or events in by the 10th for the next month’s outings.

**Hiking Classifications:**

**Distance:** 1 = 0-2 mi., 2 = 3-5 mi., 3 = 6-9 mi., 4 = 10-12 mi., 5 = 12 mi. or more.

**Elevation Gain:** A = 500’, B = 1000’, C = 1500’, D = 2000’, E = 2500’, F = 3000’ or more.

**Kayak to a Mozart concert.**

This leisurely paddle leads to the Baywood Pier, but this time we anchor off the pier to eat lunch while we listen to a Brass Ensemble play Mozart. Bring your boat and equipment, PFDs, windbreaker, binoculars, sunscreen and a lunch that you can eat in your boat. Call Jack Beigle for reservation and more details at 773-2147.

**Aug. 3, 9:30 a.m., Pismo Dunes Preserve.** Meet at Melodrama in Oceano 0930. Hike the most beautiful dunes to a Dune Lake via a secret passageway. Listen to HDThoreau. Confirm a few days before at 929-3647 or bdennen@slonet.org.

**Mon.-Thurs., Aug. 4-7, Samuel P. Taylor State Park.** Join Jack Sneddon for three nights camping at this nearby campground. Bring hiking available in Pt. Reyes or within the park. On previous visits to this park, we have always had a sell-out crowd, so for this year, I have reserved both group sites to allow for more tent space and parking. Reserve your spot, send a long MASE and your check for $65 to Jack Sneddon, 1536 Claycord Ave, Concord CA 94521. For info 925/676-3939, or Jacks2@prodigy.net. FULL REFUND WITH TWO WEEK NOTICE OF CANCELLATION.


**Sat., Aug. 9, Sierra Club Summer Picnic and Potluck.** Come join the Sierra Club for a summer picnic among friends. The exact location is yet to be determined, so check the Web site or call the office for details at 543-8717.

**Sun., Aug. 10, 9:30 a.m.: Point Sal HIKE.** Meet at end of Brown Rd. Bring optional Mt. Bike for fast ride back down hill. The first 2.5 miles is uphill (1,000 ft.). We’ll stop a lot going uphill and others will join Stan Weidert on a 5-mile hike that will do mostly nature observation. Saturday night we will be day hikes in the North Quinn Canyon Range. John Hiatt will lead a hike to the top of Troy Peak (11,298 ft.), others will join Stan Weidert on a 5-8 mile hike that will do mostly nature observation. Saturday night we will either return to Cherry Creek or relocate to lower Schofield Canyon. Sunday there will be an optional short hike before leaving for home. For more details contact Ldr: Stan Weidert (530) 474-3180; sweidert@c-zone.net, or Asst. Ldr: John Hiatt (702) 361-3171; hjhiatt@am.net. CNRCC Desert Com/ Toiyabe Chapter.

**Wed., Aug. 20, 5:30 p.m., Mystery Hike Revealed: High School Hill.** Come join Judy as she takes a hike up high school with great views of the city of SLO and the surrounding area. Meet at the Adult School parking lot off Lizzie and Johnson in SLO. Details call Judy at 543-7390.

**Sat., Aug. 23, 8:30 a.m., Morro Bay Sand Spit.** Hike along the sand spit towards Morro Rock. Moderate 8 mi. RT hike with short climb up dunes for view of Morro Bay. Bring lunch and water. Meet at the Lompoc Pizza Hut parking lot at 8 a.m. or at the Long’s Drugs in Orcutt at 8:30 a.m. SLO residents contact leader for meeting place and time. Hikes are subject to change, always contact the leader. DEAN 736-6685 (AR)

**Sun., Aug. 24, 9:30 a.m., Black Lake.** A nature tour on Land Conservancy property in an area not opened to public. Meet across from Vet Clinic just north of BL Cyn and south of Bushpoppers. Bring binoculars for birding. Confirm a few days before at 929-3647 or bdennen@slonet.org.

**Wed., Aug. 27, 5:30 p.m., Mystery Hike Revealed: Irish Hills.** Meet at the end of Madonna Road in SLO. Details call Gary at 473-3684.

**Mon., Sept. 1, 9:30 a.m., coast HIKE.** We’ll enjoy a remote area of the Nipomo Dunes on a 4 mile nature hike away from civilization/engines/people in the tradition of HDThoreau. For location check a few days before. Confirm a few days before at 929-3647 or bdennen@slonet.org.


**Sat., Sept. 6, 9:30 a.m., Valencia Peak.** Come take a 3-6 mile hike with 1,200 ft. elevation gain. Bring water, snack and dress for the weather. Meet at the Montana de Oro Visitor Center. Details call Gary (473-3694).

**Sun., Sept. 7, 9:30 a.m., Dana ADOBE.** A nature tour of Nipomos’ own historical site followed by HDThoreau on the veranda. To get there get to Nipomo via #101, go east 50 yards to Oak Glen, south on Oak Glen about a mile to DA. We’ll be crossing Nipomo Creek which is a fine riparian habitat with high species diversity. Bring binoculars for birding. Confirm a few days before at 929-3647 or bdennen@slonet.org.

**Sat., Sept. 13, Potluck Hike at Point Sal Road.** Moderate 5 mi. RT hike with uphill most of the way to our lunch destination and mostly downhill on the way back. Bring a daypack with food to share, as well as a plate, utensils, and water for yourself. Meet at the Lompoc Pizza Hut parking lot at 9:20 a.m. or Hwy 1 and Brown Road at 10 a.m. Hikes change, always contact the leader. PEGGY 733-2340 (AR)

This is a partial listing of Outings offered by our chapter.

Please check the web page at www.santalucia.sierraclub.org for the most up-to-date listing of activities.

Photo by Joaquin Palting