

## ABALONE COVE FACT SHEET

1. The State of California has stated the greatest need for public recreation is the acquisition of the California coastline between Pt. Concepcion and the Mexican border. Los Angeles County is the most deficient.
2. Only 153 miles of public, warm-water beach area is available of the 1072 miles of California coastline.
3. Over 80% of California's population resides less than one hour's drive from the coastline (almost 90% in Southern California).
4. Over 50% of the Los Angeles County coastline is in private ownership.
5. The greatest need in Los Angeles County is for public access - to the constitutionally guaranteed (both State and Federal) public tidelands - and sea.
6. Practically every public access (trail, pathway, road) in the Palos Verdes Peninsula has been fenced off to the public within the past 3 years. The public had used these accessways for at least a half century - now they cannot reach the water.
7. Some say they wish to "preserve" this area - do they mean for themselves?
8. Some say they're members of the Sierra Club, Save Our Coastline, and other similar ecology-oriented groups. How can they truly believe these principles when they want to keep the public out - and let themselves in!
9. Tide pools are now protected by Fish and Game laws (effective March 31, 1972) - they could be more easily protected with proper management. We have strongly supported the enactment of this law.
10. The argument is used, "There isn't much beach" there. Our answer is that everyone does not go to the coastline to sunbathe and frolic on the sand. Many wish to do nothing but to see - hear - and enjoy the sea! In addition, there is a growing demand in varied activity areas - fishing, skin and scuba diving, picnicking.

ABALONE COVE FACT SHEET - Page 2

11. This is not a "new" proposal. Proposals go back as far as 1940 (32 years ago!). The "Master Plan of Shoreline Development" as prepared and approved by the Regional Planning Commission on August 30, 1945 and the Board of Supervisors on September 4, 1945 - calls for acquisition of both areas in question.
12. The Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation prepared a "Proposed Shoreline Acquisition Plan" on September 30, 1959 - and again on April 11, 1961 - urging Abalone Cove as a top priority item. I quote from the report (written some 13 years ago!).

"The proposed project consists of approximately 38 acres of upland and about 2,000 lineal feet of shoreline. Most of the coves along the rugged, precipitous Palos Verdes coastline are rocky, but at Abalone Cove there is a small sandy beach affording good bathing and swimming. Offshore, there are many rocky reefs which have long been known to rock fishermen and skin divers for good yields of fish, abalone and lobsters. Anyone gaining access to the shoreline from Palos Verdes Drive South must resort to trespass.

"Abalone Cove, because of accessibility to the shoreline, evenness of upland topography and the unusual character of the coastline and offshore rocks, has the combination of attractions desirable for a public recreation area. Within the past few years, there has been considerable subdivision activity in close proximity to the west, with promise of continuing all the way to Marineland. (Note: This has happened!) Accompanied with the urban development, will be the automatic "sealing off" of access from the public roads to the mean high-tide line.

"The upland area consisting of two relatively level beaches could be developed for passive recreation use by construction of parking areas, picnic facilities, sanitary facilities, and landscaping.

"It is now strongly recommended that the property be acquired for public recreation use at the earliest possible date.

"It is estimated that this 38 acre parcel containing 2,000 lineal feet of attractive shoreline would cost approximately \$950,000." (Note: Try this price today!)

ABALONE COVE FACT SHEET - Page 3

13. The Los Angeles County Department of Beaches has requested funds to purchase all three properties in three consecutive yearly budgets.
14. The last county purchase of coastline (until last year) was in 1945!
15. There has been no "deals" made with the three firms owning the area. Up to the announcement of the proposal - there had only been one telephone conversation with an owner - that over a year ago. I have never met any of the individuals involved.
16. Many residents of the Palos Verdes Peninsula have been concerned with the density issue. This acquisition would for all time prevent any development in this area. It's the last area left without plans for development - will it stay this way?
17. If acquired - the properties would be maintained in as much a natural state as possible. Yes - pathways, picnic areas, landscaping, limited "screened" parking, and required sanitary facilities - but no typical "Coney Island" development.
18. There exists no concrete plan for the limited development. If acquired, we will meet with area homeowners, SOC, Sierra Club - and other interested parties. We currently have a Beach Advisory Committee - comprised entirely of citizens who represent every coastal interest and community.
19. If this area is not acquired - who is to say that it might not go the route of the rest of the Peninsula - high density building?
20. The "private club" concept is a natural one for many people. My position is that such a unique and wonderful luxury as the coastline cannot be the province of only a few. There is so little left - soon there will be none!
21. The road density issue is a valid one - however, the southland's greatest tourist attraction is right next door. Hopefully, bike trails will help all of us from the oppression of the automobile.
22. I predict class action suits based on the recent (February 1969) Gion and Dietz decisions of the California Supreme Court - if the public does not receive the public access they are guaranteed.

23. Yes - there are some cliffs in the area - are they safe only for private club members? We don't seal off the mountains because of cliffs! We will, however, make them as safe as humanly possible - similar to our project at Pt. Vicente (you'll note that this access hasn't caused the "public invasion" feared by some).
24. Every county facility is supervised.
25. Some express opinion against "outsiders" coming to the area. This is a philosophy that I cannot agree with.
26. Some have said - in effect "Save this area for our private beach clubs - use funds to buy other recreational projects." I say - tell me where they are!
27. Some mention they're afraid of the "ecology" of the area. So are we!
28. There absolutely will be no modification of the shoreline or of the land area - far less than any beach club. Some have said we intend to "blast" it - for a swim area. This is entirely untrue!
29. We want some fences to come down.
30. There is no residential development in the area.
31. One of the landowners has already paved some area - and modified the area - without a permit. Did the same people that wrote me complain then?
32. Some of the letters indicate that the area should only be for Palos Verdes Peninsula residents - this is very near-sighted. What an impossible situation it would be if every community felt the same.
33. Some of the writers have indicated they are taxpayers - almost everyone is in this country.