

Future Use And Operations Of Lake Berryessa Napa County, California

Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Summary of Alternatives

Lead Agency

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Reclamation, Mid-Pacific Region
Sacramento, California

October 2003

Summary

The Bureau of Reclamation has prepared this Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Visitor Services Plan to identify and assess the various management alternatives for the re-development and management of visitor services (commercial and non-commercial) at Lake Berryessa, California. A comprehensive Visitor Services Plan (VSP) as described in the Purpose and Need Statement in Chapter 1, is needed to comply with Public Law 96-375, which specified how Reclamation will manage the existing concession contracts until expiration as well as the disposition of permanent facilities when the contracts have ended, and to correct long-established recreational programs that conflict with current policy and visitor preferences, as recommended in the OIG Audit Report of 2000. As part of this planning process, Reclamation is complying with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) by preparing an Environmental Impact Statement in conjunction with the VSP.

One of the steps in the NEPA process is to develop a reasonable range of action alternatives that can be compared to the “No Action” or “projection of current conditions” alternative. This document describes the four alternatives developed for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Visitor Services Plan for public review and evaluation.

In developing the alternatives, attention was given to the recreation management objectives of the agency and current issues identified in Chapter 1, “Purpose of and Need for Action.” The guiding management document currently in effect at the reservoir is the Reservoir Area Management Plan (RAMP), developed in 1992. Elements of that plan are tightly integrated with concession agreements that govern operation of seven resorts at the lake, and those agreements are scheduled to expire in 2008-09, thereby necessitating the current planning effort. The RAMP and the 2000 OIG Audit Report may be viewed on the Reclamation website www.usbr/mp/berryessa/index.html, “Laws and Regulations”.

Alternative A is the No Action Alternative, which describes the projection of current conditions up to the expiration of the current concession contracts. Alternatives B, C, and D are the action alternatives displaying the range of options for new visitor services at Lake Berryessa.

Description of the Preferred Action, Alternative B

Under the proposed action, Alternative B, the Bureau of Reclamation (hereafter, Reclamation) would develop new facilities and programs at each of the Lake Berryessa’s seven resorts to better serve the short-term visitor. All long-term trailers would be removed from resort areas, and some of the former trailer spaces would be converted to short-term uses such as picnic and camping areas, lodging, food and beverage service, thereby increasing and improving recreational opportunities for short-term users. Lakeshore areas at the resorts would be restored to a more natural setting, and public access to those areas would be improved. Reclamation would

maintain existing day-use areas and upgrade two vehicle pullouts to improve parking and trailhead access to the reservoir.

Additional campsites, picnic areas, and recreational vehicle (RV) sites would be provided, along with customary lodging, houseboat rentals, and food, retail and marina services. A concessionaire would manage the Capell Cove launch ramp and the Camp Berryessa group campground under a fee-for-use system. Reclamation would develop a shoreline trail system and initiate a no-impact boat-in camping program. The existing special-use permit for the Monticello Ski Club would be cancelled.

Under the proposed action, Reclamation would adopt a reservoir-wide classification system, the (draft) Water Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (WROS), to designate appropriate types of recreational uses and use levels for the lake and shore areas.

This document amends Lake Berryessa's 1992 Reservoir Area Management Plan, which presently still guides recreation management at the lake. The proposed action is needed to correct over four decades of management practice under which prime shoreline areas have been reserved for exclusive long-term trailer site permittees, to the exclusion of the majority of visitors to Lake Berryessa.

A company with expertise in the commercial recreation hospitality industry was contracted to provide an economic feasibility analysis of the business potential as outlined in Alternative B. That report may be seen on the Reclamation Website, www.usbr/mp/-berryessa/index.html. "Final Feasibility Study, Visitor Services Plan, Draft Alternative B, under "Laws and Regulations". This analysis determined that Alternative B is economically feasible and provides a reasonable opportunity for a concessionaire to realize a profit. The economic analysis adopted a conservative approach because Alternative B introduces such significant changes from current operations. Typically when calculating business feasibility for the next term of a concession authorization, a major component of the work is projecting the current business. However, in this example the current business will no longer be applicable as all exclusive long-term trailer use will be eliminated and replaced with new facilities and programs that focus on traditional short-term recreation users. The feasibility analysis introduces two important concepts to help assure financial success:

- Phase in of operations over a period of years with only limited initial public services at some of the existing concession areas. The observed level of business and public demand for additional services would trigger secondary phase(s).
- Reduced number of concession operators from the current seven to as few as one. The same footprints and concession areas would be utilized as in the present operations but a single concessionaire would operate multiple locations.

Both of these conditions were suggested by the feasibility contractor in recognition of the significant level of private funding that will be required to develop the new outlined facilities and infrastructure. This scenario reflects the condition seen in numerous National Parks where a concessionaire is responsible for providing commercial visitor services at more than a single stand-alone area. This approach also allows for successful seasonal fluctuations and operations for businesses such as campgrounds, RV parks, cabin rentals, restaurants, and marinas, as examples, and eliminates the dependence on the year around revenue from exclusive long-term use trailer villages.

The present operations at Lake Berryessa relying on the year-round revenue from seven separate trailer villages display an incongruous mix of business when compared to hundreds of successful resorts and outdoor recreation support businesses throughout the country. It is not intuitively or financially correct to assume that commercial operations at Lake Berryessa can only be prosperous with a significant reliance on exclusive long-term trailer parks. However, Reclamation's financial contractor does demonstrate that adjustments, such as the two identified above, in the present business structures must occur that coincide with the proposed adjustments to the business types, that is, elimination of long-term trailer revenue.

A detailed description of the Preferred Alternative is provided in Chapter 2.

Additional Alternatives Considered

Three additional alternatives, including the No Action Alternative (Alternative A), are considered in this Visitor Services Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Statement (VSP/DEIS). Detailed descriptions of those alternatives also are provided in Chapter 2; descriptive summaries are shown below.

Relationship of Action Alternatives to 1992 RAMP

The terms of the 1992 RAMP specify that it will remain the guiding management document for Lake Berryessa until such time as the existing concession agreements expire or are cancelled. In the event that one of the action alternatives (Alternatives B, C, or D) is selected, that proposal would have to be consistent with conditions specified in the RAMP until concession agreements expire in 2008-09.

Alternative A (No Action): Continue Existing Commercial Services until Permits Expire in 2008/2009. Continue Reclamation Services and Facilities in Accordance with the 1992 RAMP/EIS.

Under the No Action Alternative, the 1992 RAMP/EIS would continue to provide guidance for management and operations at Lake Berryessa, and long-term management trends (including non-compliance with some specifications of the RAMP/EIS) would continue into the foreseeable future.

Alternative A would allow all concessionaires to continue offering services, including exclusive long-term trailer site permits, until their agreements expire in 2008-09, or until such time as operations are discontinued for any reason prior to scheduled agreement expiration. After the expiration of the existing contracts new contracts under existing conditions would be opened for competitive bidding. The numbers and variety of short-term visitor-use facilities would remain static, and the current level of facility maintenance would be continued. Reclamation would continue to monitor resort activities for compliance with existing commercial services policies and public health and safety regulations.

Reclamation also would continue managing existing day-use facilities, trails and land and water use, and would continue to administer special-use permits according to established Lake Berryessa, Central California Area Office and Bureau of Reclamation policy.

It is important to note that this No Action Alternative would not be in compliance with current policies, regulations and codes.

Alternative C: Remove Long-term Vacation Trailers and Relocate Some to Specified Resorts. Increase Quantities of Short-Term Public Facilities Provided by Concessionaires. Continue Existing Reclamation Facilities/Services. Develop Trails and Land & Water Use Zones.

Under this alternative, Reclamation would remove privately owned trailers from all existing long-term sites on prime shoreline areas, and then reintroduce a limited number of trailers at specified resorts. This proposal would accommodate the user types who traditionally have kept trailers as seasonal vacation homes at Lake Berryessa, while allowing greater public access to lakeshore that long has been reserved for private use.

During the summer months, a concessionaire also would operate, under a fee-for-use system, the Camp Berryessa group campground. Reclamation

would use the facility for outdoor education and meeting purposes during the rest of the year.

Under this alternative, Reclamation would maintain existing day-use areas, including Capell Cove, and would upgrade two vehicle pullouts to improve parking and trailhead access to the reservoir. Existing long-term special-use permits would be cancelled.

Reclamation also would adopt a reservoir-wide classification system, the Water Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (WROS), to designate appropriate kinds of recreational use and use levels for the lake and shore areas.

It is important to note that this Alternative C would not be in compliance with current Reclamation policy regarding exclusive use.

Alternative D: Reclamation to Manage, Expand and Develop Camping/Lake Access Facilities and Services. Reduce Commercial Services Provided by Concessionaires.

This alternative would give Reclamation a much greater role in day-to-day operations of facilities and programs, with a corresponding reduction in concessions services.

First, all trailers would be removed permanently from long-term permit sites. Concessionaires would continue commercial operations at five of the seven resorts, with Reclamation taking over operations at the other two resorts. In addition, Reclamation would cancel existing long-term special use permits and would directly manage the Camp Berryessa group campground, existing day-use areas and the Capell Cove launch ramp. The agency would improve two vehicle turnouts to enhance parking and trailhead access to the reservoir, develop a shoreline trail system, and initiate and manage a no-impact boat-in camping program.

Under Alternative D, Reclamation would adopt a reservoir-wide classification system, the Water Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (WROS), to designate appropriate kinds of recreational use and use levels for the lake and shore areas.

Comparison of Preferred Alternative B to the No Action Alternative A

The No Action Alternative would allow unsatisfactory conditions and trends to continue at the resorts. Reserved use of preferred shoreline by the small segment of the population with trailer-site permits would continue, to the exclusion of the general public. Day-use facilities such as camping and picnic sites, which are in high demand, would remain poorly maintained and limited in number, and would continue to be relegated to the less desirable areas of the resorts. Public access to resources would remain unsatisfactory.

Human health and safety concerns would continue to mount. Sewage treatment facilities at two of the resorts have a serviceable life of fewer than 15 years, and have been cited for health and safety violations on numerous

occasions. Those facilities would become more costly to maintain and failures likely would occur even more frequently as equipment continued to age. In addition, numerous buildings and structures present serious fire protection deficiencies, which would not be corrected and which might be exacerbated under the No Action Alternative, as existing facilities continued to deteriorate.

Impacts to scenic resources near the resorts would not be mitigated by trailer removal and structural improvements, and those impacts would likely grow as buildings continued to degrade.

The existing special-use permit would remain in effect under the No Action Alternative, limiting recreational opportunities to a broader segment of the visitor population at those locations.

Reclamation would continue to manage existing day-use facilities, including trails and water areas, as provided by the RAMP, and would proceed with currently scheduled improvement projects. Accordingly, the agency would begin retrofitting its structures to comply with accessibility standards as part of its existing Government Performance and Review Act goals for 2010, and also would upgrade the Visitor Center/Museum under existing provisions.

In comparison, Alternative B would improve visitor access to preferred recreational areas, upgrade and expand visitor facilities such as trails and campgrounds, and correct known health and safety problems.

Specifically, under the Preferred Alternative, Reclamation would permanently eliminate all exclusive long-term trailer sites from the resorts, opening up space for short-term camping and picnicking and allowing full public access for the first time in more than 40 years. Unsightly residential materials would be removed, and resort lakeshore areas would be returned to a more natural appearance, thereby reducing or eliminating impacts to scenic resources.

Under Alternative B, concessionaires would expand their hospitality and recreational accommodations, offering food and provisions sales, retail and marina services, house boating opportunities, cabins, and camping and RV sites, as well as new formal lodging and dining opportunities. They would collect user fees at the Capell Cove launch ramp and the group campground. Existing resort facilities and utilities systems would be upgraded or replaced to meet health, safety and accessibility standards.

Further, Reclamation would improve two highway turnouts to provide better parking and access to the lake, would continue to maintain all the day-use sites along the west shore, and would develop a new network of hiking trails. The agency would cancel the existing special-use permit, and would remodel the reservoir's Visitor Center/Museum to meet accessibility requirements.

The Water Recreation Opportunity Spectrum would be employed to identify new use classifications for the reservoir's numerous islands, lake surface and the vicinity of Oak Shores, Smittle Creek, Big and Small Islands and the entrance to Steele Canyon Cove. These classifications would improve the visitor experience and protection of lake resources.

Comparison of the Preferred Alternative B to Alternative C

Alternative C would offer many of the same features as the proposed action, differing mainly in its treatment of trailer-site permits. Under Alternative C, all trailers initially would be removed, but a limited number of trailers would later be re-established in specific resorts, whereas all trailers would be permanently removed under the Preferred Alternative. Alternative C could accommodate some existing users of the trailer sites while opening up previously reserved shoreline areas for public day-use. However, the area available for development of day-use facilities would be smaller than that available under the Preferred Alternative, due to the continuing need to reserve some space for trailer sites.

Overall, Alternative C would improve public access to the lakeshore, remove personal property from otherwise scenic areas, and return the shoreline to a more natural condition.

In this alternative, Reclamation and a concessionaire would share the management of the Camp Berryessa group camp, but the Capell Cove launch ramp would be managed solely by Reclamation. The agency also would continue to maintain all the day-use sites along the lake's west shore, develop a new trail network, remodel the Visitor Center/Museum, and upgrade all public and commercial facilities to meet accessibility standards. The existing special-use permit would be cancelled.

As in the Preferred Alternative, Alternative C calls for improvements to two highway turnouts to provide better parking and access to the lake.

Under both alternatives, Reclamation also would adopt a reservoir-wide classification system, the Water Recreation Opportunity Spectrum, to designate appropriate use levels for the lake and shore areas. The islands, shoreline sites, and lake surface would be assigned a new use classification under this system.

Comparison of the Preferred Alternative B to Alternative D

Alternative D assigns a greater role to Reclamation for day-to-day operations at Lake Berryessa, thereby reducing concession opportunities.

As in the Preferred Alternative, Alternative D would remove trailers from all seven of the commercial resorts. Under Alternative D, however, Reclamation then would assume direct management of two of those resorts. Initially, the agency would offer limited services and short-term accommodations at the resorts that it operated, but could expand those services and accommodation as demand increased. Ultimately, the same variety of accommodations and services described for Alternative B would

be available under Alternative D, but the total number of facilities (e.g., camp sites) would be less than that provided by the Preferred Alternative.

As in the Preferred Alternative, personal property would be removed from the trailer sites and those areas would be opened up for general public use. Public access to the lakeshore would be improved, and scenic values would improve as the shore areas are returned to a more natural appearance.

Reclamation would continue to maintain all day-use sites along the reservoir's west shore, develop a new trail network, remodel the Visitor Center/Museum, insure that accessibility standards (ADA) are met at all public facilities, and cancel the existing special-use permit. The agency would upgrade two highway turnouts to provide better parking and access to the lake, and would adopt the WROS classification system to designate appropriate kinds of recreational use and use levels for the lake and shore areas.

Summary of Impacts and Mitigations Table S 1 is a summary comparison of the environmental impacts for all of the alternatives. Table S 2 is a summary of environmental impacts and appropriate mitigating/monitoring measures associated with the Preferred Alternative (B). These tables are not offered as a definitive description of impacts and mitigations, but as a summary for easy reference. Detailed analyses of environmental impacts and mitigating measures are presented in Chapter 3.

Summary Comparison of Impacts by Alternative

Summary Table S 1.1

Impact Category	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Alternative Description	No Action	(Preferred) Remove trailers, develop short-term facilities, Concession operates Capell Cove, Camp Berryessa, upgrade visitor center, road-side turnouts, develop trails, manage uses under WROS.	Remove/reinstall small number of trailers, develop short-term facilities, concession seasonally operates Camp Berryessa, upgrade visitor center, roadside turnouts, develop trails, manage uses under WROS.	Remove trailers, develop short-term facilities, Reclamation to operate two resorts, upgrade visitor center, roadside turnouts, develop trails, manage uses under WROS.
Land Use	Impact due to concessions permits in non-compliance with current Reclamation policy and regulations for commercial services.	Positive impact	Violation of Reclamation Policy regarding Exclusive Use.	Positive impact
Geology, Soils, Topography.	Impact due to existing unstable slopes.	Similar to Alternative A. Short-term impact due to resort construction	Similar to Alternative A. Similar to Alternative B.	Similar to Alternative A. Similar to Alternative B.
Biological Resources	Impact to floodplain from trailers inundated by water levels above 440'. Potential impact to water quality as aging sewage treatment facilities continue to deteriorate	Beneficial impact from replacing/ flood-proofing sewage treatment facilities, removing threat of discharge. Positive impact to bird populations from WROS. Impact to wildlife, vegetation, from resort and trail construction.	Similar to Alternative B. Similar to Alternative B. Similar to Alternative B	Similar to Alternative B. Similar to Alternative B. Similar to Alternative B

Impact Category	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Alternative Description	No Action	(Preferred) Remove trailers, develop short-term facilities, Concession operates Capell Cove, Camp Berryessa, upgrade visitor center, road-side turnouts, develop trails, manage uses under WROS.	Remove/reinstall small number of trailers, develop short-term facilities, concession seasonally operates Camp Berryessa, upgrade visitor center, roadside turnouts, develop trails, manage uses under WROS.	Remove trailers, develop short-term facilities, Reclamation to operate two resorts, upgrade visitor center, roadside turnouts, develop trails, manage uses under WROS.
Cultural Resources	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact	No Impact
Traffic and Circulation	No change	No impact, will be monitored	No impact, will be monitored	No impact, will be Monitored
Noise	Potential impact due to increase in boat use and absence of WROS designation.	Positive impact due to non-motor zones.	Positive impact due to non-motor zones.	Positive impact due to non-motor zones.
Recreation	No change in sub-standard short-term use facilities.	Beneficial impact to visitor experience with increase in day use facilities. Beneficial impact due to WROS designation. Impact to exclusive long-term trailer owners.	Similar to Alternative B. Similar to Alternative B. Similar to Alternative B.	Similar to Alternative B. Similar to Alternative B. Similar to Alternative B.
Scenic Resources	Continued impact due to deteriorating structures, trailers, docks, seawalls and shorelines.	Beneficial impact due to environmentally sensitive resort design, new facilities, rehabilitated Shorelines.	Similar to Alternative B with limited number of trailers.	Similar to Alternative B.

Impact Category	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Alternative Description	No Action	(Preferred) Remove trailers, develop short-term facilities, Concession operates Capell Cove, Camp Berryessa, upgrade visitor center, road-side turnouts, develop trails, manage uses under WROS.	Remove/reinstall small number of trailers, develop short-term facilities, concession seasonally operates Camp Berryessa, upgrade visitor center, roadside turnouts, develop trails, manage uses under WROS.	Remove trailers, develop short-term facilities, Reclamation to operate two resorts, upgrade visitor center, roadside turnouts, develop trails, manage uses under WROS.
Socio-Economic Environment	<p>No change to seasonal population No change to employment</p> <p>Must compete for new contracts</p> <p>Impact to short-term visitors due to lack of access, facilities.</p> <p>Continued poor local business environment</p> <p>Impact due to certain resort inaccessibility Beneficial impact from ADA accessibility upgrades by Reclamation in 2006.</p>	<p>Impact to seasonal population due to removal of trailers. Beneficial impact to employment, income due to resort development, increased visitor services.</p> <p>Impact to existing concessions due to expiring contracts, cost of removal of structures.</p> <p>Beneficial impact to short-term users due to increased number of facilities, access to shorelines.</p> <p>Beneficial impact to local businesses due to larger number of day-use visitors.</p> <p>Beneficial impact due to ADA accessibility features included in resort design and Reclamation upgrades.</p>	<p>Similar to Alternative B.</p> <p>Similar to Alternative B.</p> <p>Similar to Alternative B.</p> <p>Similar to Alternative B.</p> <p>Similar to Alternative B.</p>	<p>Similar to Alternative B.</p> <p>Similar to Alternative B.</p> <p>Similar to Alternative B.</p> <p>Similar to Alternative B.</p> <p>Similar to Alternative B.</p>

Impact Category	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Alternative Description	No Action	(Preferred) Remove trailers, develop short-term facilities, Concession operates Capell Cove, Camp Berryessa, upgrade visitor center, road-side turnouts, develop trails, manage uses under WROS.	Remove/reinstall small number of trailers, develop short-term facilities, concession seasonally operates Camp Berryessa, upgrade visitor center, roadside turnouts, develop trails, manage uses under WROS.	Remove trailers, develop short-term facilities, Reclamation to operate two resorts, upgrade visitor center, roadside turnouts, develop trails, manage uses under WROS.
Socio-Economic Environment (cont')	Continuing impact to low income visitors due to cost of resort services.	Potential beneficial impact due to elimination of resort entrance fees.	Similar to Alternative B.	Similar to Alternative B.
Public Safety	Continuing impact due to structural fire protection deficiencies in resorts. Potential impact to law enforcement coverage for the Reservoir, under current staffing levels. Potential impact to Health, Safety coverage for the Reservoir under current staffing levels.	Beneficial impact due to structural fire protection strategies included in resort design. Beneficial impact due to compliance with applicable codes and standards, concurrent with work load analysis. Beneficial impact due to compliance with applicable codes and standards, concurrent with work load analysis.	Similar to Alternative B. Similar to Alternative B.	Similar to Alternative B. Similar to Alternative B.
Hazardous Materials/Soil Contamination.	Continuing impact to soils due to leaks from old resort fuel tanks.	Beneficial impact due to compliance with applicable codes and regulations	Similar to Alternative B.	Similar to Alternative B.

Summary of Impacts, Mitigation/Monitoring Measures: Preferred Alternative (B)

Summary Table S 2.1

<p>3.1 Land Use No impact</p>	
<p>3.2 Geology, Soils, Topography</p> <p>3.2-3: Potential Impacts Due to Seismic Instability, Changes in Topography, Erosion, Soil Movement from Excavation, Grading or Fill. The proposed action involves the excavation and fill of surface material during resort construction. There is potential for minor erosion to occur during these activities.</p> <p>3.2-4: Potential Impact Due to Land Subsidence or Unstable Soil Conditions. The proposed action would include the management of Capell Cove Launch Ramp by a concessionaire. Slope instability would continue to be a factor until repairs are completed.</p>	<p>Reclamation would require that Best Management Practices be included in all construction activities to minimize potential soil erosion during resort construction.</p> <p>Engineering studies to be undertaken in 2004 will determine the most effective method of permanent stabilization</p>
<p>3.3. Biological Resources.</p> <p>3.3-12: Potential Impacts to Mammals. The proposed action would involve the temporary minor disturbance of mammals in the immediate vicinity of the resorts and adjacent to the proposed shoreline trail, during construction activities</p> <p>3.3-13: Potential Impacts to Birds (Common and Protected) The proposed action would involve the temporary disturbance of birds in the immediate vicinity of the resorts and adjacent to the shoreline trail during construction activities.</p> <p>3.3-17: Potential Impacts to Vegetation Implementation of the proposed action would result in the loss of vegetation during the construction of the resorts and in the construction of the shoreline trail. As the vegetation is neither locally or regionally significant and does not support special status species, the impact is considered minor.</p> <p>3.3-22: Potential impacts to Air Quality. The proposed action would result in the creation of airborne dust and various emissions associated with resort construction. As these activities would only occur in designated areas and at certain times of the year, they would not result in major impacts to local or regional ambient air quality.</p>	<p>Monitor during construction.</p> <p>Monitor during construction</p> <p>Monitor during construction</p> <p>Dust and emission abatement strategies would be a part of the construction plans required by Reclamation</p>

Summary of Impacts, Mitigation/Monitoring Measures: Preferred Alternative (B) Summary Table S 2.2

<p>3.4 Cultural Resources No impact</p>	
<p>3.5 Traffic and Circulation No impact</p>	
<p>3.6 Noise</p> <p>3.6-2: Potential Impacts Due to Noise. During resort construction activities, noise levels would increase, depending on equipment being used and the scope of work.</p> <p>Once facilities are open to the public, noise levels would increase due to the concentration of motorized watercraft and motor vehicles in and around the resort areas. These increases, however, are minor. Noise levels elsewhere on the reservoir occur primarily when powerboats congregate at various locations during summer weekends. Potential adverse effects to visitors or wildlife have not been observed and noise, on these occasions, is not considered an impact.</p>	<p>Noise abatement procedures would be part of the construction plans required by Reclamation.</p> <p>Noise monitoring procedures may eventually be included in resort and lake operations, as conditions warrant.</p>
<p>3.7 Recreation.</p> <p>3.7-12: Potential Impacts to Visitor Profile. This proposed action would remove all exclusive long-term trailers, adversely affecting long-term users and creating an alteration to the visitor profile. This affect would be off-set by a potential increase in day-use visitation.</p> <p>3.7-13: Potential Impacts to Visitor Experience. Implementation of the proposed action would adversely affect the on-site experience of the exclusive long-term users with the removal of trailers. However, the addition of short-term facilities would encourage an increase in day-use visitation, offsetting potential impacts to overall visitor experience.</p> <p>3.7-16: Potential Impacts to Overnight Use Activities. The potential adverse affects to both long-term and short-term users are the same for this proposed action as in previous impacts statements for Recreation.</p>	<p>Monitor by periodic visitor surveys</p> <p>Monitor by periodic visitor surveys</p> <p>Monitor by periodic visitor surveys</p>
<p>3.8 Scenic Resources No impacts</p>	

Summary of Impacts, Mitigation/Monitoring Measures: Preferred Alternative (B) Summary Table S 2.3

<p>3.9 Socio-Economic Environment.</p> <p>3.9-2: Potential Impacts to Population. The proposed action requiring removal of all exclusive long-term trailers from the resorts, would temporarily impact the local population as seasonal residents were displaced. This impact, however, would be offset, particularly during the summer season, with an increase in short-term users as more day-use facilities were made available.</p> <p>3.9-49: Potential Impacts to Concession Services and Facilities. The proposed action would impact existing concessionaires by removing preferential rights for contract renewal and would limit compensation for resort facilities judged unusable or unneeded by Reclamation at the close of the current contracts.</p>	<p>Monitor by periodic visitor surveys</p> <p>Monitor by periodic visitor surveys</p>
<p>3.10 Public Safety</p> <p>3.10-34: Potential Impacts to Law Enforcement. The implementation of the proposed action may increase the potential for impacts to the Napa County law enforcement coverage at Lake Berryessa.</p> <p>3.10-49: Potential Impacts to Health and Safety. The implementation of the proposed action may increase the potential for impacts to county and state emergency services coverage of the reservoir area.</p>	<p>A survey of county law enforcement workload would establish level of coverage necessary. If warranted, additional staff may be funded under HR-2925, or by concessionaires as part of new contracts.</p> <p>A survey of Napa County and CDF emergency services workload would establish level of coverage necessary. If warranted, additional staff may be funded under HR-2925, or by concessionaires as part of new contracts.</p>
<p>3.11 Hazardous Materials and Soil Contamination No impact</p>	