

## **Lake Oroville SRA General Plan**

Public Meeting, November 30, 2004

Kelly Ridge Golf & Country Club, Oroville

### **Summary of Public Comments and Questions**

State Parks held a public meeting on the Draft General Plan from 6:30 p.m. to 9 p.m. on Tuesday, November 30, 2004 at the Kelly Ridge Golf & Country Club located at 5131 Royal Oaks Drive. Approximately 30 people attended the meeting. Represented agencies and organizations included California State Parks, Feather River Recreation and Parks District, Department of Water Resources, the City of Oroville, the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, and the California State Horsemen's Association. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce the draft plan and to describe how the public can submit their comments before the plan is delivered to the Department of Water Resources in early January 2005. After a 30 minute slide presentation the meeting was opened to public questions and comments. The following are the public comments (square bullets) and State Park staff responses (round and indented bullets):

- Will all general plan proposals be included in the DWR 20-year recreation management plan?
  - *Most proposals are in the DWR plan. Some additional ideas are included that could be considered later.*
- State parks plan should be consistent with DWR plan.
  - *Development timeline is connected with DWR re-licensing process.*
- Future state park funding (bonds) are needed to implement state park proposals not built through DWR.
- Inform the public about how and when you create advisory groups. Listen to all advisory groups. Open the process to new committee members and opportunities for wide public input.
  - *State Parks is committed to work with all interested people and user groups.*
- Recognize the relationship between FERC and State Parks.
- Allow for volunteers in trails construction and maintenance.
- Provide a copy of the plan to those who request them.
  - *We will provide CDs and printed copies of the plan to those who request them.*
- What does the plan say about carrying capacity?
  - *The plan goes into substantial detail about carrying capacity. The plan's analysis determined that if all the plan's proposals were built or implemented the carrying capacity would not be exceeded for any of the recreation sites.*
- Fix the launch ramp at Dark Canyon for access at low water levels.
- Provide horse stables and concession horse rentals and/or boarding.

- State Parks should do NEPA analysis for environmental issues.
- Trails Advisory Committee - should consult with local clubs (Bike, Horse, etc.) to reflect community needs.
- Don't pick just 2-3 people to represent all user groups.
- Any OHV use potential in future for LOSRA?
  - *OHV division of State Parks is looking at OHV needs and requirements in adjacent OHV parks.*
- Look to other parks (such as Mt. Diablo and Mt. Tamalpais) for successful multi-use trails.
- Future detailed plans should mesh with DWR plans - Join efforts to involve public through DWR "RAC" (Recreation Advisory Committee)
- Add a concrete launch ramp at the Diversion Pool- gravel can be dangerous.
  - *The General Plan has flexibility on details like surfaces used for ramps.*
- Lakeland is not in the SRA - remove from the General Plan
- DPR should consider contracts with other recreation districts in areas where there may be positive benefits for all concerned.
- Promote privatization of State Parks lands where appropriate to provide recreation services with savings to the state.
- There is a wide-range of opportunities for such partnerships. Develop strategies for cost-benefit efficiencies. Consider local users and their needs.
- Request that special park fees be established for local residents
- 1973 plan emphasizes open space preservation. Natural beauty is important. Keep these values in 2005 general plan. Need balance between recreation and resource values. Manage exotic species control and eradicate invasive species but some exotics like turkeys are valuable to keep. Allow some natural areas to remain undeveloped and not over used.
- Are multi-use trails designated because of cost? Is that the case of Oroville?
  - *Cost may be one factor but other factors are considered. Multi-use trails are allowed where appropriate (they are not appropriate in all places).*
- Trails advisory committee does not represent views of all users.
- Include a guideline that reflects the unique conditions at LOSRA and allows local users to help develop trail maintenance guidelines. Statewide trail guidelines aren't always best.
- NEPA required where federal approvals are necessary.
- CEQA requires baseline studies. Baseline trail use surveys were done when they were managed as multi-use. At that time, LOSRA was out of FERC compliance, which makes them invalid for basing future trail planning. No valid studies were done on the existing use (now that the trails were reverted to the pre-multi-use classification).
  - *DWR studies were used as the basis and initial data for the General Plan.*
  - *Additional data will be gathered at the time of project implementation.*