

# FOLSOM

Folsom Lake State Recreation Area & Folsom Powerhouse State Historic Park  
**General Plan/Resource Management Plan**



**Volume 1**  
**FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT /**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT:**  
**RESPONSE TO COMMENTS**  
**List of Commenters and Master Responses**

*Prepared for*  
California Department of Parks and Recreation and  
United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation

**August 2009**





# FOLSOM

Folsom Lake State Recreation Area & Folsom Powerhouse State Historic Park  
**General Plan/Resource Management Plan**



**Volume 1**  
**FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT /**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT:**  
**RESPONSE TO COMMENTS**  
List of Commenters and Master Responses

*Prepared for*

**California Department of Parks and Recreation**

Arnold Schwarzenegger, Governor  
Mike Chrisman, Secretary for Resources  
Ruth Coleman, Director of Parks and Recreation

Department of Parks and Recreation  
P.O. Box 942896  
Sacramento, CA 94296-0001

**United States Department of the Interior,  
Bureau of Reclamation**

Bureau of Reclamation Mid-Pacific Region-  
Federal Office Building  
2800 Cottage Way  
Sacramento, CA 95825-1898

**August 2009**



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1.0 – INTRODUCTION.....	1-1
1.1 Purpose of the Response to Comments Document.....	1-1
1.2 CEQA and NEPA Requirements in Responding to Public Comment.....	1-2
1.3 Final EIR/EIS.....	1-3
1.4 Environmental Review and Planning Process .....	1-3
1.5 DPR Decision Process and Documents .....	1-4
1.6 Reclamation Decision Process and Documents .....	1-5
1.7 Final GP/RMP.....	1-5
 CHAPTER 2.0 – LIST OF COMMENTS RECEIVED.....	 1-7
2.1 Introduction.....	1-7
2.2 Comment Matrix.....	1-7
 CHAPTER 3.0 – MASTER RESPONSES .....	 1-21
3.1 Planning Process Comments .....	1-21
3.1.1 Master Response PP-1: Extend Public Review and Comment Period .....	1-21
3.1.2 Master Response PP-2: Consider Input of all Groups .....	1-22
3.2 General Comments on the Plan and Alternative Preference.....	1-22
3.2.1 Master Response ALT-1: Lease of Folsom Lake SRA Lands/Development of Lake Natoma Shoreline.....	1-22
3.2.2 Master Response ALT-2: Recreation Improvements in the Preliminary GP/RMP versus the 1979 General Plan .....	1-23
3.2.3 Master Response ALT-3: Proposed “Hybrid” Alternative .....	1-31
3.3 Comments on Chapter II, Existing Conditions.....	1-36
3.3.1 Master Response EC-1: California Historical Landmark #585 – Pioneer Express Trail.....	1-36
3.3.2 Master Response EC-2: Visitor and Telephone Survey .....	1-36
3.3.3 Master Response EC-3: Existing Equestrian Use and Facilities .....	1-37
3.4 Comments on Chapter III, Natural Resources and Wildfire Management. 1- 39	
3.4.1 Master Response NR-1: Prescribed Fire.....	1-39
3.5 Comments on Chapter III, Visitor Services, Aquatic Recreation.....	1-40
3.5.1 Master Response BOAT-1: Five MPH Speed Zones and “Quiet Days” .....	1-40
3.5.2 Master Response BOAT-2: Gasoline Boat Engines on Lake Natoma .....	1-42
3.5.4 Master Response BOAT-3: Boat Launch Ramps.....	1-43
3.6 Comments on Chapter III, Visitor Services, Camping.....	1-44
3.6.1 Master Response CAMP-1: Camping .....	1-44
3.7 Comments on Chapter III, Visitor Services, Trails.....	1-44
3.7.1 Master Response TR-1: Trail Enforcement .....	1-44
3.7.2 Master Response TR-2: Dogs Off-Leash .....	1-45

3.7.3	Master Response TR-3: Trail Maintenance .....	1-45
3.7.4	Master Response TR-4: Trail Signs .....	1-46
3.7.5	Master Response TR-5: Trail Types .....	1-46
3.7.6	Master Response TR-6: Specific New Trails and Trail Connections .....	1-46
3.7.7	Master Response TR-7: Trail Safety .....	1-47
3.7.8	Master Response TR-8: Use of Volunteers.....	1-48
3.7.9	Master Response TR-9: Night Mountain Bike Riding.....	1-48
3.7.10	Master Response TR-10: Trail Management Plan.....	1-49
3.7.11	Master Response TR-11: Equestrian Facilities .....	1-49
3.7.12	Master Response TR-12: Trail Use.....	1-50
3.7.13	Master Response TR-13: Access from Adjacent Private Property .....	1-52
3.7.14	Master Response TR-14: New Trail Underpass .....	1-53
3.7.15	Master Response TR-15: Motorized and Non-Motorized Use of Trails.....	1-54
3.7.16	Master Response TR-16: Trail Connectivity and Non-Motorized Access ....	1-54
3.8	Comments on Chapter III, Unit-Wide Services, Multi-Use Facilities.....	1-54
3.8.1	Master Response MUF-1: Multi-Use Facility at Brown’s Ravine .....	1-54
3.9	Comments on Chapter III, Unit-Wide Operations.....	1-55
3.9.1	Master Response UWO-1: Land Acquisition.....	1-55
3.9.2	Master Response UWO-2: User Fees .....	1-55
3.10	Comments on Chapter III – Specific Area Goals and Guidelines, Mississippi Bar .....	1-55
3.10.1	Master Response MB-1: Horse Stable Concession (Shadow Glen) .....	1-55
3.11	Comments on Chapter IV – Environmental Analysis .....	1-56
3.11.1	Master Response EIR/EIS-1: Qualifications of EIR/EIS Preparers .....	1-56
 CHAPTER 4.0 – RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE PRELIMINARY GP/RMP AND DRAFT EIR/EIS .....		1-59
4.1	Introduction.....	1-59
4.2	Recommended Changes to the Preliminary GP/RMP.....	1-59
4.2.1	Executive Summary Added .....	1-59
4.2.2	Recommended Changes to Chapter II- Existing Conditions.....	1-73
4.2.3	Recommended Changes to Chapter III- The Plan .....	1-78
4.3	Recommended Changes to the EIR/ EIS.....	1-95
4.3.1	Recommended Changes to Section 4.1- Introduction.....	1-95
4.3.2	Recommended Changes to Section 4.4- Environmental Consequences .....	1-99
 CHAPTER 5.0 – REPORT PREPARATION.....		1-109
5.1	Final EIR Preparers.....	1-109
	California Department of Parks and Recreation.....	1-109
	U.S. Department of the Interior-Bureau of Reclamation.....	1-109
	Wallace, Roberts & Todd, LLC-Prime Consultant .....	1-109
	LSA Associates, Inc.....	1-109

## TABLES

Table 2.A: Comment Matrix.....	1-8
Table 3.A: Comparison of the Facilities Propose in the 1979 General Plan and Facilities Proposed in the 2008 Preliminary GP/RMP.....	1-26

This page left blank.

# CHAPTER 1.0 – INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 PURPOSE OF THE RESPONSE TO COMMENTS DOCUMENT

The Folsom Lake State Recreation Area (Folsom Lake SRA) and Folsom Powerhouse State Historic Park (Folsom Powerhouse SHP) Preliminary General Plan/ Resource Management Plan (Preliminary GP/RMP) defines the broadest management framework for the development, ongoing management, and public use of Folsom Lake SRA and Folsom Powerhouse SHP by providing a defined purpose and vision with long-term goals and guidelines. The document will guide future efforts to balance recreation and conservation, protect natural and cultural resources, and expand opportunities for public enjoyment of the Sierra Nevada Foothills setting. The document represents a combined California Department of State Parks and Recreation (State Parks) General Plan and United States Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) Resource Management Plan for the Folsom Lake SRA and Folsom Powerhouse SHP.

A GP/RMP must undergo programmatic environmental analysis as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Chapter 4.0 of the Preliminary GP/RMP is the Draft EIR/EIS for the proposed plan in compliance with the planning requirements for both agencies and State and Federal environmental analysis requirements under CEQA and NEPA. Use of an integrated EIR/EIS is encouraged by both NEPA and CEQA. The Draft EIR/EIS identifies the likely environmental consequences resulting from implementation of the Preliminary GP/RMP. The Draft EIR/EIS evaluated each topical area and determined that all potential adverse environmental impacts can be reduced to a less than significant level through implementation of specific guidelines incorporated into the Preliminary GP/RMP or through mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR/EIS.

The purpose of this document is to respond to comments on the Preliminary GP/RMP and the Draft EIR/EIS and make revisions to those documents, as necessary, to respond to these comments or to clarify any previous errors, omissions, or misinterpretations of the material in these documents.

## 1.2 CEQA AND NEPA REQUIREMENTS IN RESPONDING TO PUBLIC COMMENT

As a joint environmental document, the response to comments must satisfy the requirements of both CEQA and NEPA for responding to public comments. The CEQA Guidelines, Section 15088, requires that the Lead Agency evaluate comments received during the noticed comment period (and any extensions) and prepare a written response for each comment relating to the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Written responses must describe the nature of the environmental issues raised (e.g., revisions to the proposed project to mitigate anticipated impacts or objections) and provide a good faith, reasoned analysis in response or explain why specific comments and suggestions were not accepted. Statements unsupported by factual information do not constitute an adequate response. The response to comments may take the form of a revision to the Draft EIR or may be a separate section in the Final EIR. Where the response to comments makes important changes to the text of the Draft EIR, the Lead Agency should either revise the text in the body of the EIR, or include marginal notes showing that the information is revised in the response to comments (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15088).

NEPA requires that an agency assess and consider comments on the Draft EIS, both individually and collectively, and respond by: 1) modifying alternatives, including the proposed action; 2) developing and evaluating alternatives not previously considered; 3) supplementing, improving, or modifying the analyses; 4) making factual corrections; or 5) explaining why the comments do not warrant further response. In the latter case, the agency must also cite the sources, authorities or reasons in support of their position and indicate those circumstances under which the agency would reassess their response. All substantive comments received on the Draft EIS must be attached to the Final EIS. Minor changes resulting from the response to comments may be indicated on errata sheets and attached to the Draft EIS. In these cases, only the comments, responses and changes and not the Final EIS need be circulated for public review (40 CFR 1503.4).

No comments were received on the Draft EIR/EIS that resulted in any new impacts or a change in significance level of impacts, required new mitigation, consideration of new alternatives, or any other substantial changes to the Draft EIR/EIS. Changes made to the Draft EIR/EIS in response to comments are limited to minor corrections of errors and omissions. Recirculation of the EIR/EIS is not required where the new information added to the EIR/EIS merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR/EIS (CEQA Guidelines Section 150885.b); and changes in response to comments are minor and are confined to factual corrections or explanations of why

comments do not require further agency response (40 CFR Section 1503.4). This Response to Comments document meets CEQA and NEPA requirements for responding to comments and recirculation of the Draft EIR/EIS is not required.

### **1.3 FINAL EIR/EIS**

This document, together with the Draft EIR/EIS, will constitute the Final EIR/EIS if the California State Parks and Recreation Commission and Reclamation's **Regional Director of the Mid-Pacific Region**, certify the Final EIR/EIS as complete and adequate under CEQA and NEPA, respectively.

### **1.4 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND PLANNING PROCESS**

California State Parks and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation released the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area and Folsom Powerhouse State Historic Park Preliminary General Plan/Resource Management Plan (Preliminary GP/RMP) and Draft EIR/EIS for public review on February 8, 2008. Consistent with NEPA/CEQA requirements, affected agencies, organizations, and persons who may have an interest in this project were notified of the release of the Preliminary GP/RMP and the Draft EIR/EIS. The Preliminary GP/RMP and Draft EIR/EIS were also posted on the State Parks website. In compliance with the requirements of both CEQA and NEPA, the original 45-day comment period was to end March 23, 2008. In consideration of requests from the public for additional time to review the documents, the comment period was extended twice, first for an additional 37 days through April 30, 2008, and a second time for an additional 30 days through May 30, 2008. State Parks and Reclamation believe that this total of 112 days for public review and comment on the Preliminary GP/RMP and Draft EIR/EIS was sufficient for all interested members of the public to review and provide comment on these documents.

The Preliminary GP/RMP, the Draft EIR/EIS, and this Response to Comments document will be presented to the State Park and Recreation Commission and to Reclamation's Regional Director at a public hearing in the summer or fall of 2009, at which time these agencies will consider a recommendation regarding approval of the Preliminary Plan (with the changes proposed in this Response to Comments document) and the EIR/EIS. If Reclamation and State Parks certify the EIR/EIS and decide to approve the Preliminary Plan, a finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and Notice of Determination (NOD) will be prepared and filed with the Federal Register and State Clearinghouse. The FONSI and

NOD will include a description of the project, the date of approval, and the address where the Final EIR/EIS and record of project approval are available for review.

The environmental document serves as a first tier EIR/EIS. In compliance with CEQA and NEPA, the environmental analysis is broad and programmatic and does not include specific project-level analysis for facilities considered in the document. The EIR/EIS describes probable impacts of implementing future development and the goals and guidelines identified in the GP/RMP. Additional project-specific environmental analysis will be conducted, as appropriate, for facility development, management plans or other improvements proposed in the GP/RMP and the EIR/EIS will serve as a reference for these future environmental documents. If Reclamation or State Parks, pursuant to Sections 1500.4, 1500.5 and 1502.2 of the NEPA Guidelines and Section 15162 of the State CEQA Guidelines, determines that no new effects would occur or no new mitigation measures would be required, subsequent projects can be approved as being within the scope of the project covered by the Final EIR/EIS. In such cases, no new environmental documentation would be required, although a Notice of Exemption (NOE) would be filed under CEQA as dictated by State Parks policy. If a specific project identified in the Final GP/RMP would result in effects not examined in the Final EIR/EIS, preparation of an additional environmental document would be required (NEPA Regulations Section 1502.20 and State CEQA Guidelines §15168(c)(1)). When appropriate, this more detailed, project-specific environmental review will be “tiered” to the EIR/EIS prepared for the GP/RMP.

## 1.5 DPR DECISION PROCESS AND DOCUMENTS

Using information from the Resource Inventory, public input, and recommendations from State Parks and Reclamation staff, a Preliminary GP/RMP was prepared and made available for public review. The Preliminary GP/RMP identifies a preferred concept for addressing resource preservation goals as well as the recreation needs of the community. In compliance with CEQA and NEPA, Chapter 4.0 of the Preliminary GP/RMP represents a joint, programmatic environmental document, Draft EIR/EIS, which evaluates the potential environmental impacts associated with implementing the preferred concept and several alternatives to the preferred concept. As described above, the Preliminary GP/RMP was released for public review on February 8, 2008 through May 30, 2008.

In compliance with CEQA and NEPA, this Response to Comments document has been prepared to provide responses to all of the public comments received on the Draft EIR/EIS and recommend proposed changes to the Draft EIR/EIS to respond to comments and to clarify any previous errors, omissions, or misinterpretations of the material in the Draft

EIR/EIS. Although responses to comments on the Preliminary GP/RMP are not required as part of the environmental review, State Parks has committed to providing the public with responses to their comments on the Preliminary GP/RMP, as well as the Draft EIR/EIS. Responses to comments on the Preliminary GP/RMP are also included in this document.

This Response to Comments document, together with the Preliminary GP/RMP and Draft EIR/EIS, constitute the GP/RMP that will be presented to the California State Park and Recreation Commission for their review and approval. Following their review, a Final GP/RMP will be prepared that incorporates the changes identified in this document as well as any additional recommendations requested by the Commission.

## **1.6 RECLAMATION DECISION PROCESS AND DOCUMENTS**

No Federal decision will be made on the proposed action, the Preliminary Plan, until at least 30 days after the release of this Final EIR/EIS. After this 30-day waiting period, Reclamation will complete a Records of Decision (ROD), which will document Reclamation's decision to choose one of the alternatives including the proposed action and no action. The final EIR/EIS will be used to support this decision. The ROD will address: the decision and the alternatives considered; the alternative(s) considered to be environmentally preferable; the factors that were considered; whether or not all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm for the alternative selected have been adopted, and if not, why; any monitoring and enforcement program established to ensure identified mitigation measures are accomplished; and any significant comments received on the Final EIR/EIS. The Mid-Pacific Regional Director will approve the ROD after the California State Park and Recreation Commission action.

## **1.7 FINAL GP/RMP**

As described above, the Preliminary GP/RMP, Draft EIR/EIS, and this Response to Comments Final EIR/EIS document which includes proposed changes to the Preliminary GP/RMP, constitute the GP/RMP that will be considered by the California State Park and Recreation Commission and Reclamation's Regional Director of the Mid-Pacific Region. Following their review and approval, a Final GP/RMP will be prepared that incorporates the changes identified in this document as well as any additional recommendations requested by the Commission and/or Regional Director.

This page left blank.

# CHAPTER 2.0 – LIST OF COMMENTS RECEIVED

## 2.1 INTRODUCTION

State Parks and Reclamation released the Preliminary GP/RMP and Draft EIR/EIS for Folsom Lake SRA and Folsom Powerhouse SHP on February 8, 2008. In compliance with the requirements of CEQA and NEPA, the original 45-day comment period was to end March 23, 2008. In consideration of requests from the public for additional time to review the documents the comment period was extended twice, first for an additional 37 days through April 30, 2008, and a second time for an additional 30 days through May 30, 2008. During this 112-day comment period, a total of 403 post-mailed and e-mailed comment letters were received, as well as a form letter with 24 signatories, and three petitions with a total of 1,001 signatories.

## 2.2 COMMENT MATRIX

The comment matrix below contains a complete list of all the comment letters received and indicates where each letter is printed in Volume II of this document. The matrix includes the letter number, name of commenter, the organization with which the commenter is affiliated, if any, the date the comment letter was received, and the page number on which the comment letter and responses appear.

**Table 2A: Comment Matrix**

<b>Comment Matrix - Folsom Lake SRA GP/RMP and EIR/EIS</b>				
<b>Letter</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Page Number</b>
1	Nova Blazej	Environmental Protection Agency	04/01/08	2-2
2	Dawn Cheser	California Department of Transportation	03/27/08	2-14
3	Christopher Huitt	Department of Water Resources	03/06/08	2-15
4	Alan Jackson	None	03/06/08	2-16
5	Vance Kimbrell	Placer County Parks Department	04/25/08	2-17
6	Tom Maneri	None	04/01/08	2-18
7	John Poimiroo	None	03/16/08	2-19
8	Dave & Linda Poston	None	03/19/08	2-20
9	Peg Rein	Placer County Community Development Dpt.	03/20/08	2-21
10	Paul Sanders	None	03/22/08	2-25
11	Karen Sullivan	None	03/13/08	2-26
12	Kirk Uhler	None	05/30/08	2-28
13	Vince Underwood	None	03/06/08	2-29
14	Clyde Zirbel	None	03/06/08	2-30
15	Jeff Barker	None	03/05/08	2-31
16	Steve Bowman, PE	None	04/08/08	2-32
17	David Brandeberry	None	03/06/08	2-35
18	Debbie Cederdahl	None	04/30/08	2-36
19	Mike Finta	None	04/30/08	2-41
20	Patricia Gibbs	None	04/24/08	2-43
21	Marylin Jasper	Sierra Club	04/30/08	2-53
22	Brad Kearns	None	05/28/08	2-56
23	Guy Kolling, ASLA	Sacramento County Department of Regional Parks	05/28/08	2-57
24	Robert Kramer	None	04/17/08	2-59
25	Janet Peterson	None	04/30/08	2-60
26	Sharon Roseme	None	02/29/08	2-66
27	Raymond Santana	None	03/17/08	2-75
28	Robert Summersett	None	04/01/08	2-77
29	Robert Sydnor	None	04/30/08	2-78
30	Dan Corcoran	El Dorado Irrigation District	03/24/08	2-88

31	John Doolittle & Daniel Lungren	Congress of the United States, House of Representatives	04/30/08	2-91
32	Sophia Rowlands	Downey Brand Attorneys LLC	04/30/08	2-94
33	Patricia Gibbs	None	05/28/08	2-98
34	Robert Holderness	Holderness Law Firm	04/30/08	2-102
35	Mike McKeever	Sacramento Area Council of Governments	04/29/08	2-117
36	Kerry Miller	City of Folsom	03/27/08	2-118
37	Kerry Miller	City of Folsom	04/29/08	2-135
38	Kerry Miller	City of Folsom	05/23/08	2-140
39	Kerry Miller	City of Folsom	05/29/08	2-151
40	Kathie Perry	Western States Trail Foundation	04/19/08	2-154
41	Peggy Peter	None	03/11/08	2-157
42	Douglas Pringle	Disabled Sports USA Far West	03/04/08	2-159
43	Roberta Raymond, D.V.M	None	04/27/08	2-161
44	Melinda Rivasplata	None	05/30/08	2-162
45	Form Letter- 24 Signatories (listed below)			2-163
	Victoria Alexander	None	03/11/08	
	Joanne Arnold	None	03/11/08	
	Janet Bucci	None	03/11/08	
	Aaron Cagle	None	03/11/08	
	Carol Dawb	None	03/11/08	
	Deborah Dawn	None	03/11/08	
	Nancy Degan	None	03/11/08	
	Judy Grayson	None	03/11/08	
	Misty Hay	None	03/11/08	
	Christine Holsteat	None	03/11/08	
	Kendra Krisley	None	03/11/08	
	Kelly Lynch	None	03/11/08	
	Coleen Martin	None	03/11/08	
	Shelley McDonoag	None	03/11/08	
	Susan McDowney	None	03/11/08	
	Anna Nakashoji	None	03/14/08	
	Kim O'Brien	None	03/14/08	
	Julie Ormsby	None	03/11/08	
	Hans Peter	None	03/11/08	
	Peggy Peter	None	03/11/08	
	Heidi Votino	None	03/10/08	
	John Votino	None	03/11/08	

	Janet Wackerly	None	03/11/08	
	William Wister	None	03/11/08	
46	Christine Kaiser	None	03/11/08	2-164
47	Hans Peter	None	03/11/08	2-166
48	Jennifer Airo	None	03/02/08	2-167
49	Lloma Alameda	None	03/14/08	2-168
50	Roxanne Allgeier	None	03/28/08	2-169
51	Mike Ammon	None	05/19/08	2-174
52	Joanne Arnold	None	03/05/08	2-176
53	Jennifer Aufill	None		2-177
54	Melissa Avila	None	03/05/08	2-181
55	Holly Azevedo	None		2-182
56	Darlene Baker	None	03/31/08	2-183
57	Helen Baldwin	None	03/02/08	2-184
58	Claudia & Bill Ball	Backcountry Horsemen of California	04/30/08	2-186
59	Katie Baygell	None	05/28/08	2-188
60	Mark Bentley	None	03/21/08	2-189
61	Karen Biane	None	04/28/08	2-190
62	Linda Black	None	03/03/08	2-191
63	Margie Boeye	None	03/03/08	2-192
64	Laurel Brent-Bumb	Joint Chambers Commission of El Dorado County		2-196
65	Lea Brooks	Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates	03/23/08	2-197
66	David Brown	None		2-202
67	Jane Browne	None	04/29/08	2-203
68	Sharon Brunberg	None	04/05/08	2-205
69	Deborah Bryne	Dry Creek Parkway Advisory Committee	04/22/08	2-206
70	Tina & Richard Carey	None	03/22/08	2-207
71	Gail Carlson	None		2-208
72	Don Carter	None	03/05/08	2-212
73	Judy Carnazzo	None	04/29/08	2-213
74	Kathryn Carter	None	03/05/08	2-214
75	Matt Carter	None	03/05/08	2-215
76	Katie Cather	None	04/29/08	2-216
77	James Cheng	None	03/25/08	2-218
78	Frank Cirill	Lake Natoma Community Task Force	05/14/08	2-219
79	Neil Davis	Ukiah Valley Trail Group	04/02/08	2-222
80	Susan DeBruin	None	04/03/08	2-223
81	John Easley	None	04/16/08	2-229

82	Patty Engman	None	03/25/08	2-230
83	Robin Everett	None	03/20/08	2-232
84	Sandy Hollcroft	None	02/29/08	2-234
85	Al Frei	None	03/22/08	2-236
86	Donna Furlow	None	04/28/08	2-238
87	Gisele Fuson	None	04/25/08	2-239
88	Guy Fuson & Kathy Dombrowski	Loomis Basin Horsemen's Association	04/16/08	2-241
89	Kelly Godwin	None	03/03/08	2-247
90	Patrick Godwin	None	03/27/08	2-249
91	Judy Grayson	None	03/05/08	2-250
92	Stephen Green	Lake Natoma Heights Homeowners' Association	05/27/08	2-251
93	Jim & Cathy Haagen-Smit	International Mountain Biking Association	03/22/08	2-254
94	Dean & JoAnn Handy	None	05/22/08	2-256
95	Theresa Haney	None	03/13/08	2-258
96	Barbara Heyward	None	03/30/08	2-259
97	Ronald Hitchcock	None	03/17/08	2-260
98	Chris Hodges	None	04/29/08	2-262
99	John Holland	River City Paddlers, Inc.	05/30/08	2-267
100	Kenneth & Bonnie Houston	Shadow Glen Stables	04/15/08	2-269
101	Betty January	None	03/24/08	2-271
102	Kevin Jennings	None	03/05/08	2-272
103	Mary Johnson	Gold Country Trails Council	03/13/08	2-273
104	Carolee Jones	None	03/26/08	2-275
105	Mary Jones	None		2-277
106	Sonia Junghardt	None	03/21/08	2-281
107	Kathy Kaestner	None	03/03/08	2-282
108	Donna Statzell	None	03/02/08	2-283
109	Aaron Karr	None	03/08/08	2-285
110	Lynn Kirst	None	03/19/08	2-286
111	Kandace Kost-Herbert	None	03/31/08	2-287
112	Kathryn Lambert	None	03/03/08	2-288
113	Joe & Cindy Larkin	None	04/29/08	2-289
114	Barbara Lawrie	None	04/22/08	2-291
115	Larry Litz	None	03/04/08	2-292
116	Lois Loudon	None	03/03/08	2-294
117	Judi Magaw	None		2-296
118	Michele Magee	None	03/03/08	2-300
119	Douglas Mahone	None	03/02/08	2-301
120	Patrick Maxfield	Heritage Preservation League	05/28/08	2-306

121	Charles McCann	Folsom Area Bicycle Advocates	04/30/08	2-309
122	Susan McGivney	None	03/05/08	2-310
123	Bonita McGowan	None	03/03/08	2-311
124	Sharon Melberg	None	04/10/08	2-313
125	Pat Miller	Windmill Farm	05/02/08	2-314
126	Emma Moresi	None		2-315
127	Holly Moresi	None		2-316
128	Paul Moresi	None		2-317
129	Ethan Mulvihill	None	03/01/08	2-318
130	Tenaya Mulvihill	None	03/01/08	2-319
131	Deborah Murphy	None	05/21/08	2-320
132	Nancy Neice	None	03/25/08	2-323
133	Ken Nelsen, PhD	None	03/05/08	2-325
134	William Nolan	None	04/04/08	2-327
135	Pete & Karin Occhialini	None	4/41/2008	2-328
136	Edwin Oto	None	03/18/08	2-331
137	Carol Pchelkin	None	03/18/08	2-332
138	Donna Peck	None	03/18/08	2-336
139	Dorothy Peterson	None	04/04/08	2-338
140	Karen Phillips	None	03/27/08	2-339
141	Betty Pfiefer	None	03/05/08	2-344
142	Tim Plank	None	03/04/08	2-345
143	David Ragsdale & Rosemary Griffin-Ragsdale	None	03/29/08	2-346
144	Jim Ricker	North Fork American River Alliance	04/30/08	2-347
145	Rob Roth	None	03/08/08	2-348
146	Joanne Saunders & Karla Hanks	None		2-350
147	Nancy Sandy	None	03/30/08	2-354
148	Georgie Saydak	None	03/05/08	2-355
149	Roxanne & David Schilling	None	04/26/08	2-356
150	Micheal Schoellkopf	None	04/01/08	2-358
151	Jennifer Schubert	None	03/01/08	2-359
152	Penny Scribner	El Dorado Equestrian Trails Foundation	03/17/08	2-361
153	Walt Seifert	Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates	05/27/08	2-363
154	John Skinner	Sierra Outdoor Recreation	03/15/08	2-364
155	Stephen, Rebecca & Kelsey Stewart	None	03/02/08	2-365
156	Mariane Stuart	None	05/01/08	2-366
157	Pablo Sust	None	03/29/08	2-367

158	Judy Suter	None	04/10/08	2-370
159	Judy Suter	None	04/30/08	2-373
160	Sharon Taylor	None	04/02/08	2-375
161	Dennis & Janet Thompson	None	04/04/08	2-376
162	Jamie Thompson	None	03/02/08	2-377
163	Suzanne Thurman	Double T Training and Livestock	03/27/08	2-379
164	Tony Virrueta	None		2-383
165	Merrilee Vuscovich & Jeff Posner	None	03/20/08	2-387
166	William Michael Wauters	None	02/15/08	2-388
167	Lois Watts	None	03/05/08	2-389
168	Nancy Loudon Weiner	None	03/03/08	2-390
169	Charlie Willard	None	05/22/08	2-393
170	Dennis Williams	None	03/05/08	2-396
171	Donna Williams	None	05/30/08	2-397
172	Donna Williams	None	04/28/08	2-400
173	Marisa Williams	None	03/23/08	2-408
174	Craig Wilson	Folsom-Auburn Trail Riders Action Coalition	03/20/08	2-409
175	James Yee	None	05/21/08	2-410
176	T Abraham	None	04/30/08	2-412
177	Lloma Alameda	None	04/17/08	2-414
178	Carlos Allison	None	03/06/08	2-415
179	Anita Anderson	None	04/28/08	2-416
180	Chestine Anderson	None	04/02/08	2-417
181	Cathy & Greg Andrews	None	03/18/08	2-418
182	Cathy Andrews	None	03/20/08	2-419
183	Hans Apel, Pamela Burton, Colin Apel, & Alan Apel	None	03/11/08	2-420
184	Jesai Bancroft	None	03/22/08	2-421
185	Crystal Barber	None	05/23/08	2-422
186	Wendy Belt	None	03/21/08	2-427
187	Mary Benson	None	03/20/08	2-428
188	Pat Binley	None	03/21/08	2-429
189	Pat Binley	None	04/22/08	2-430
190	Jeanie Blevins	None	04/03/08	2-431
191	Linda Boisa	None	03/22/08	2-432
192	Nancy Bonde	None	04/02/08	2-433
193	Faith Boucher, Ph.D.	None	04/18/08	2-434
194	Elizabeth Breckenridge	None	03/22/08	2-435
195	Marilynn Bridger	None	03/22/08	2-436
196	Fritz Bronner	None	03/20/08	2-437

197	Lea Brooks	Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates	03/23/08	2-438
198	Jackie Brookshire-Doyle & Kevin Doyle	None	04/24/08	2-439
199	Cheri Brown	None	03/21/08	2-440
200	Lyle & Donna Brown	None	05/10/08	2-441
201	Lynn Brown	Equestrian Trails Inc.	03/18/08	2-442
202	Michelle Brown	None	03/24/08	2-444
203	Henriette Bruun	None	04/02/08	2-445
204	Sherrie Bunk	None	05/27/08	2-446
205	Dayna & Adrian Burgeson	None	05/29/08	2-447
206	Ann Burke	Marin Horse Council, Inc.	04/09/08	2-448
207	Lisa Burke	None	05/28/08	2-449
208	Bruce Cameron	None	02/28/08	2-450
209	Candy	None	03/18/08	2-451
210	Tammy Carrion	None	04/02/08	2-452
211	Linda Clarke	None	03/20/08	2-453
212	Neva Cimaroli	None	05/29/08	2-454
213	Gary Coverdale	None	04/04/08	2-455
214	John Connelly	None	03/14/08	2-456
215	Kathryn Corbett	None	05/29/08	2-457
216	Matt Crowley	None	02/19/08	2-459
217	Alberta & Elizabeth Daffner	None	04/28/08	2-460
218	Alex Aguilar	None	03/06/08	2-461
219	Laurene Davis	None	06/09/08	2-462
220	Catherine Dee	None	04/23/08	2-463
221	Doug DiRuscio	None	03/03/08	2-464
222	Diana Eastman	None	06/09/08	2-465
223	Russ Fay	None	04/07/08	2-466
224	Natalie Fenner	None	04/30/08	2-467
225	Mike Finta	None	05/30/08	2-469
226	Mike Finta	None	05/30/08	2-470
227	Bob & Dorothy Foster	None	03/18/08	2-471
228	Curtis Fowler	None	05/29/08	2-472
229	Tracey Fremd	None	03/12/08	2-473
230	Helen Gallagher	None	05/26/08	2-474
231	Jennifer Garcia	None	04/04/08	2-475
232	Katie Garfinkel	None	03/20/08	2-476
233	Ruth Gerson	None	03/29/08	2-477
234	D.A. (Doc) Graybill	None	03/25/08	2-478
235	Randy Hackbarth	None	05/30/08	2-479
236	Deborah Hall	None	06/09/08	2-483

237	Bob Hanna	None	05/26/08	2-484
238	Steve Hansen	None	04/07/08	2-485
239	Scott Hanson	None	04/02/08	2-486
240	Susan Harrer	None	03/28/08	2-487
241	Tim Harris	None	03/12/08	2-488
242	Meiry Heatlie-Hayes	None	05/01/08	2-489
243	Vince Hayes	None	04/30/08	2-491
244	Gerald Heitzler	None	04/20/08	2-492
245	Louise Herr	None	03/20/08	2-493
246	Valeri Herr	None	03/24/08	2-494
247	Maureen Henderson	None	05/29/08	2-495
248	Will, Barb & Travis Henderson	None	04/07/08	2-496
249	Richard Herms	None	03/21/08	2-497
250	Louise Herr	None	03/29/08	2-498
251	Jared Hockenberry	None	04/21/08	2-499
252	Kevin Hoffman	None	05/29/08	2-500
253	Connie Hooten	None	03/25/08	2-501
254	Robert Horowitz	None	03/12/08	2-502
255	Kathryn Howard	None	03/21/08	2-504
256	Denise Hume	None	03/20/08	2-505
257	Jason Ianziti	None	04/01/08	2-506
258	Doug Jackson	None	03/24/08	2-507
259	Marie Jankowski	None	03/22/08	2-508
260	Betty January	None	03/24/08	2-509
261	Pam Jennings	None	03/31/08	2-510
262	Valerie Jensen	None	05/17/08	2-511
263	Brian Joder	None	05/01/08	2-512
264	Douglas Johnson	None	03/12/08	2-514
265	Silja Johnson	None	04/12/08	2-515
266	Tom Judy	Cool Cycling Club	03/30/08	2-516
267	Sonia Junghardt	None	03/21/08	2-517
268	Shana Kaplan	None	04/01/08	2-518
269	Aaron Karr	None	03/07/08	2-519
270	Cathy Kastner	None	03/12/08	2-520
271	Keith & Lucy Kataoka	None	04/28/08	2-521
272	Kathy & Brian	None	03/31/08	2-522
273	Barry Keller	None	03/30/08	2-523
274	Desiree King	None	04/05/08	2-524
275	Kate & Bruce Kirby	None	03/26/08	2-525
276	Kate Kirby	None	03/31/08	2-526
277	Kevin Knauss	None	03/01/08	2-527

278	Kevin Knauss	None	03/06/08	2-528
279	John & Viki LaCamera	None	04/04/08	2-529
280	Jennifer Lane	None	05/27/08	2-530
281	Jim & Cena Larimer	None	04/30/08	2-531
282	Lauren	None	03/19/08	2-532
283	Laurette Laurent	None	03/11/08	2-533
284	Laurette Laurent	None	05/17/08	2-534
285	Laurette Laurent	None	05/12/08	2-536
286	Laurette Laurent	None	06/09/08	2-538
287	Jacklyn Leo	None	04/09/08	2-539
288	Shara Llewellyn & Lee Roy Moss	None	06/09/08	2-540
289	Daryl Lossing	None	03/20/08	2-541
290	Lucinda	None	04/01/08	2-542
291	Bob Lundin	None	03/09/08	2-543
292	Stacey Magee	None	03/21/08	2-544
293	Carol Malcolm	None	03/03/08	2-545
294	Shelley Mathews	None	04/08/08	2-546
295	John Matoba	None	05/28/08	2-547
296	Michelle Matoba	None	05/28/08	2-548
297	Terry McCoy	None	06/09/08	2-549
298	Linda McDonald	None	04/17/08	2-550
299	Catherine McKeand	None	03/20/08	2-551
300	Michelle McKenzie	None	04/25/08	2-552
301	Diane Medlock	None	04/02/08	2-553
302	Jennifer Forsberg Meyer	None	03/20/08	2-554
303	Obie Miller	None	03/31/08	2-555
304	Jeff Mitchell	None	05/30/08	2-556
305	Diana Mittelberger	None	03/20/08	2-557
306	Carla Monday	None	03/24/08	2-558
307	Charles Moore	None	03/21/08	2-559
308	Deborah Murphy	None	04/16/08	2-560
309	Jan Nahas	None	03/18/08	2-561
310	Renea Negri	None		2-562
311	Manda Ness	None	04/25/08	2-565
312	Kim Nunez	None	04/30/08	2-566
313	Steve Offerman	None	05/28/08	2-567
314	Diane Offutt	None	03/16/08	2-568
315	Glen Otey	None	04/02/08	2-569
316	George Palma	None	04/02/08	2-570
317	Art Pancheri	None	05/28/08	2-571
318	Stephen Parsons	None	03/21/08	2-572

319	Michael Pavik, PE	None	02/29/08	2-573
320	Cheri Painter	None	03/13/08	2-574
321	Geraldine Peterson	None	03/21/08	2-575
322	Pat Peterson	None	04/30/08	2-576
323	Charlie Pike	None	03/09/08	2-579
324	Dave Poston	None	03/18/08	2-580
325	Gary Preston	None	04/08/08	2-581
326	Courtney Puffer	None	05/18/08	2-582
327	Herbert Puffer	None	05/17/08	2-583
328	Meredith Reinhart	None	03/21/08	2-584
329	Lonni Reno	None	03/31/08	2-585
330	Anita & Peyton Reyes	None	03/19/08	2-586
331	Carolyn Riolo	None	03/21/08	2-587
332	Kurt Robinson	None	04/04/08	2-588
333	Gerald Rogan	None	03/11/08	2-589
334	Don Rose	None	04/08/08	2-593
335	Sharon Roseme	None	05/30/08	2-594
336	Sharon Roseme	None	05/31/08	2-596
337	Sara Sales	None	05/13/08	2-598
338	Brian Sharp	None	04/09/08	2-599
339	Phyllis Shopbell	None	05/29/08	2-600
340	Donald Staniszewski	None	04/02/08	2-601
341	Louise Stevenson	None	03/25/08	2-602
342	Yezin Taha	None	05/28/08	2-603
343	Candace Taylor	Sacramento Horseman's Association	03/20/08	2-604
344	Patricia Terrell	None	03/20/08	2-605
345	Susan Trout	None	04/09/08	2-606
346	Warren Truitt	None	04/22/08	2-607
347	Pam Van Brocklin	None	04/02/08	2-608
348	Mike Vandeman	None	03/13/08	2-609
349	Patricia van Guilder	None	03/20/08	2-610
350	Terri VanSlike	None	03/30/08	2-611
351	Marie Veerkamp	None	03/18/08	2-612
352	Jacqueline Wahleithner	None	04/10/08	2-613
353	Penny Walgenbach	None	03/21/08	2-614
354	Chris Walker	None	03/26/08	2-615
355	Dagmar Wheeler	None	03/20/08	2-616
356	James White	None	04/24/08	2-617
357	Marsh Wildman	None	03/26/08	2-618
358	Tara Williams	None	03/20/08	2-619
359	Daniel Winkelman	None	05/16/08	2-620

360	Daniel Winkelman	None	04/17/08	2-621
361	Sandyjean Winward	None	03/20/08	2-622
362	Lyle Wright	None	03/21/08	2-623
363	Paula Campbell	None	05/01/08	2-625
364	Paula Campbell	None	03/23/08	2-626
365	Paula Campbell	None	04/29/08	2-627
366	Petition-278 Signatories	None	05/01/08	2-630
367	Online Petition- 536 Signatories	None	05/01/08	2-631
368	Petition-197 Signatories	None	05/01/08	2-632
369	David Thesell & family	None	04/02/08	2-633
370	JoAnne Saiz	None	03/02/08	2-634
371	Catherine Dee	None	04/04/08	2-635
372	Dorothy Foster	None	03/17/08	2-636
373	Lorianne Walker	None	03/29/08	2-637
374	Eric King, Steve Miklos, Kerri Howell, Andy Morin, & Jeff Starsky	City of Folsom	03/26/08	2-640
375	Andrew Morin	County of El Dorado Joint Powers Authority	03/31/08	2-642
376	Susan DeBruin	None	05/27/07	2-644
377	Susan DeBruin	None	04/29/08	2-649
378	Marianne Stuart	None		2-655
379	Vicky Fletcher	Yolo County's Sheriff's Posse	04/03/08	2-656
380	Mike Finta	None	02/25/08	2-658
381	Mike Finta	None	02/16/08	2-660
382	Mike Flaherty	None	03/02/08	2-661
383	Form Letter – 3 signatories (listed below)			2-662
	Rebecca & Mike Friesen	None	04/03/08	
	Mike and Marilyn James	None	04/03/08	
	Ann Maines	None	04/03/08	
384	Steve Graning	None	02/28/08	2-663
385	Louise Herr	None	03/20/08	2-664
386	Paul Hield	None	02/10/08	2-665
387	Muffet McCleneghan	None	02/10/08	2-666
388	Mike McGee	None	02/17/08	2-667
389	Debbie Murphy	None	02/19/08	2-668
390	Kurt Robinson	None	03/07/08	2-669
391	Sandy Ruggiero	None	02/13/08	2-670
392	Rich Scollay	None	04/29/08	2-671
393	David Strain	None	04/09/08	2-675

394	Stephani Turner	None	03/19/08	2-677
395	Robert Ubry	None	02/11/08	2-678
396	Shelley & Bob Weisickle	None	04/30/08	2-679
397	Bonita Young	None	03/21/08	2-680
398	George Maier	None	04/03/08	2-681
399	Crystal Barber	None	03/13/08	2-682
400	Jeremy Bernau	FEDCorp	04/29/08	2-683
401	Meiry & Vince Hayes	None	05/01/08	2-690
402	Guy Kolling, ASLA	Sacramento County Regional Parks	05/16/08	2-691
403	Alan D. Wade	Save the American River Association, Inc.	05/22/08	2-694

This page left blank.

# CHAPTER 3.0 – MASTER RESPONSES

Common concerns were repeated throughout many of the comment letters. The most common topic was trail use, including trail enforcement and maintenance, multi-use or single use trails, expansion or linking of trails, trail access from adjacent public or private lands, trail safety, facilities for equestrians or mountain bikers, the Trail Master Plan, and trail signs and maps. Other recurrent concerns included those relating to public participation and inclusion in the planning process, the preferred general plan alternative, motorized or non-motorized boating and boating facilities, prescribed fire, camping, user fees, acquisition of land, and the Shadow Glen Stables concessionaire. These recurrent themes are addressed below by a series of Master Responses. Each Master Response has a corresponding numbered code that indicates the broad topic of the response. For example, the fourth Master Response relating to trail use has the code “TR-4”. In Volume II, individual comments that are addressed by these Master Responses are referred to by the appropriate code (i.e., “Please see Master Response TR-4”). The Master Responses are printed below in the order that the topic they address appears in the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area (SRA) and Folsom Powerhouse State Historic Park (SHP) Preliminary General Plan/Resource Management Plan (Preliminary GP/RMP).

## 3.1 PLANNING PROCESS COMMENTS

### 3.1.1 Master Response PP-1: Extend Public Review and Comment Period

California State Parks (State Parks) and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) released the Preliminary GP/RMP and Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS) for the Folsom Lake SRA and Folsom Powerhouse SHP on February 8, 2008. The original 45-day comment period, consistent with the requirements of CEQA and NEPA, was to end March 23, 2008. In consideration of requests from the public for additional time to review the documents the comment period was extended twice, first for an additional 37-days through April 30, 2008, and then a second time for an additional 30-days through May 30, 2008. State Parks and Reclamation believe that this total of 112 days for public review and comment on the Preliminary GP/RMP and Draft EIR/EIS are sufficient for all interested members of the public to review and provide comment on these documents.

### **3.1.2 Master Response PP-2: Consider Input of all Groups**

State Parks and Reclamation believe all user groups have had the opportunity to provide input into the planning process, including stakeholder meetings and a public workshop held in the fall of 2002 regarding issues the plan should address. The stakeholder meetings included representatives from user groups and interest groups, staff from various departments of adjacent cities and counties, state agencies and others. A second public workshop was held in June 2003 regarding alternate management concepts for the two park units. Two stakeholder meetings specifically addressing trail issues were held in 2002 and 2003. A Resource Inventory was prepared regarding the existing conditions within the two park units and a visitor survey was conducted in 2004. Four project newsletters and several notification postcards were sent out to the mailing list of more than 700 names. The project web page, on the State Parks internet site provided information with links to documents throughout the planning process. Three public meetings were held in March and April 2008 regarding the Preliminary GP/RMP. More than 400 letters and e-mailed comments were received during the comment period. State Parks met with representatives from equestrian and mountain bike groups, the City of Folsom, local elected officials, the Sacramento Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce and others during the public comment period. No user group has been excluded from participating in the planning process and many equestrian users have provided input regarding the Preliminary GP/RMP.

The Preliminary GP/RMP provides direction for the continued involvement of trail users and interest groups and State Parks anticipates multiple opportunities for public and user group involvement in the development of the Trail Management Plan.

## **3.2 GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE PLAN AND ALTERNATIVE PREFERENCE**

### **3.2.1 Master Response ALT-1: Lease of Folsom Lake SRA Lands/Development of Lake Natoma Shoreline**

California State Parks manages the federal lands within Folsom Lake SRA and Folsom Powerhouse SHP through a long term lease agreement with Reclamation. The original fifty year agreement was developed and approved in 1956. This agreement expired in 2006. State Parks and Reclamation have been working on a new long term management agreement. In the interim, until a new long term agreement is finalized, the agencies have been operating under the old agreement by mutual consent.

The Preliminary GP/RMP does not include any development proposals for the SRA lands along Lake Natoma beyond those recreation improvements described in the Preliminary GP/RMP and the proposed changes to the GP/RMP included in this document. State Parks believes that the provisions for recreation access and facilities provided for in the Preliminary GP/RMP (including the proposed changes in this document) for this portion of the SRA are appropriate given the very narrow land base of the SRA, the topography (steep in places) and the other natural and cultural resources in this area. The proposed changes to the GP/RMP provided in this document add direction to improve trail connections and recreation access in the SRA lands adjacent to the City of Folsom Historic District and the potential to create trail connections and pedestrian access from the City's corporation yard property. See the proposed additions to the direction for the Natoma Shore North Management Zone in Section 4.2 of this document, "Recommended Changes to the Plan."

The Preliminary GP/RMP does not include a proposal to lease portions of the SRA or SHP to cities or counties. The direction in this Plan will guide the future management and development of the SRA including the shoreline of Lake Natoma.

### **3.2.2 Master Response ALT-2: Recreation Improvements in the Preliminary GP/RMP versus the 1979 General Plan**

Since the last General Plan was approved in 1979 there have been many changes in land use, conditions and types and patterns of recreation use. Ideas and facilities from the 1979 General Plan that are still relevant and appropriate are included within the new Preliminary GP/RMP. Thirty years ago when there was less development in the immediate vicinity of the park unit, the recreation area was much more of a destination park. The park now gets tremendous daily use with such activities as trail riding, jogging, bicycling, paddling, rowing, and personal water craft use. Some of these activities, such as mountain biking and personal water craft use, hardly existed 30 years ago. This plan provides accommodations for a variety of new recreation uses.

Not all of the facilities proposed in the 1979 General Plan have been built. Some of those undeveloped proposals are no longer possible to build because of changes in conditions over the past 30 years. Examples include:

- A lake view restaurant was proposed for the Observation Point area adjacent to Folsom Dam. Observation Point is now the location for the new auxiliary spillway being built for flood control under the Joint Federal Project between the US Bureau of Reclamation and US Army Corps of Engineers and this area is no longer available for public use.

- A second entrance was proposed for the North Granite Bay area with many associated facilities and additional parking. The 1979 General Plan assumed land acquisitions would be made to enable the development of this second entrance to alleviate traffic congestion at the Douglas Boulevard entrance. The 1979 General Plan was clear that without this second entrance, many of the facilities proposed would not be possible. As part of the development proposal for the Los Lagos subdivision, Placer County required the dedication of a corridor of land from Auburn Folsom Road to Folsom Lake SRA through the subdivision. The purpose of this dedication was to provide public access to the SRA, including roads and trails. The County eventually deeded the corridor to the State and it became part of the SRA. The original development agreement between the developer and Placer County and the subsequent grant deeds between the County and developer and the County and State place conditions on the development of an access road on this corridor. These conditions include a provision that a public access road would not be developed until the Rocklin Road extension was completed, and that the intersections of the public access road and the internal subdivision roads needed to be grade separated. These conditions present challenges to creating a major new park entrance in this location.
- A West shore marina was proposed at Dike 5, an area with shallow lake depths. The 1979 General Plan assumed Auburn Dam and Reservoir would be built which would have stabilized the fluctuation of Folsom Reservoir at higher levels and hence would have made this marina facility feasible. Under today's conditions, with the likelihood of more frequent and longer periods of lower lake levels, a marina at this location would be unusable for a significant portion of most years.

The new Preliminary GP/RMP provides many additional recreation opportunities and facilities, including:

- Expansion of the existing marina by 200-340 slips and development of a 2<sup>nd</sup> marina if acquisitions provide such opportunity. Add launching capacity by extending ramps or adding lanes.
- Expansion of the Peninsula campground (currently 104 sites) by 50-100 campsites.
- Addition to or improvement of picnic facilities at: Lake Overlook, Mississippi Bar, Negro Bar, Willow Creek, Rattlesnake Bar, Beal's Point and Folsom Point.

- Replacement/enlargement of Granite Bay activity center, addition of new multi-use facilities at Browns Ravine/Folsom Pt and Nimbus Flat, addition of a new visitor center, addition of the Negro Bar Cultural Center.
- Addition of trails and improvement of trailheads.

See Table 3.A for a comparison of existing recreation facilities, facilities proposed in the 1979 General Plan and facilities proposed in the Preferred Alternative in the Preliminary GP/RMP.

**Table 3.A: Comparison of Facilities Proposed in 1979 General Plan and Facilities Proposed in 2008 Preliminary GP/RMP**

Facilities	1979 General Plan Proposals	Existing Condition – 2008	2008 Preliminary GP/RMP – Preferred Alternative	Notes
<b>FOLSOM LAKE</b>				
<b>Boat Ramps</b>	Prior to 1979 General Plan there were 9 ramps, 30 lanes.  1979 General Plan proposed adding 1 ramp, 4 lanes	13 ramps, 51 lanes  This is the total of all ramps and lanes, the availability of ramps and lanes varies by lake level.	<b>Extend existing ramps</b> and add lanes for additional low water access and high water access. Includes Granite Bay, Rattlesnake Bar, Hobie Cove, Folsom Pt	
<b>Marina</b>	Prior to 1979 General Plan marina had 553 slips.  1979 General Plan proposed adding up to 137 slips to existing marina (600-700 total) Add 200-slip marina at Dike 5*	685 slips	<b>-Add 200-340 slips</b> to existing marina (885-1,025 slips total) -Plan also provides for a 2 <sup>nd</sup> marina if land acquisition provides a suitable opportunity.	* Preliminary GP/RMP analyzed Dike 5 as potential marina site. Dike 5 not suitable for a marina due to shallow topography and lack of upland area for facilities.
<b>Total Parking</b>	Prior to 1979 General Plan there were 2520 parking spaces  1979 General Plan proposed adding 2,780 for 5,300 total*	Approximately 3,740  (2,070 boat parking, 1,216 beach & picnic parking, 454 other)	Preliminary GP/RMP proposes additional facilities which will add parking, including at Rattlesnake Bar and Browns Ravine.	*1979 General Plan acknowledged if traffic issues not resolved at Granite Bay, many facilities proposed at GB would not be built.
<b>Whitewater boating facilities</b>	Access and Parking for 60 vehicles	2 paved parking areas, 2 ramp access areas, parking for 70 vehicles and 12 buses	Preliminary GP/RMP proposes property acquisition to develop additional parking in Salmon Falls area.	
<b>Equestrian &amp; Bike/Hike Camping</b>	3 areas	1 hike-in area, 2 campsites		
<b>Campgrounds/ Campsites</b>	Prior to 1979 General Plan - 2 campgrounds, 130 sites  1979 General Plan proposed adding 100 campsites.	2 campgrounds, 173 campsites	-50-100 sites to be added at Peninsula. A <b>net addition of 30-80 individual campsites*</b> (203-253 sites total).	*Shifting group camp from Negro Bar to Beal's Pt will reduce individual sites by 20.

Facilities	1979 General Plan Proposals	Existing Condition – 2008	2008 Preliminary GP/RMP – Preferred Alternative	Notes
<b>Picnic Sites</b>	Prior to 1979 General Plan there were 527* picnic sites.  1979 General Plan proposed adding 764 sites or tables.	270 total  Granite Bay (189), Beal's (53), Browns Ravine (25), Peninsula (6)	-Develop additional picnic facilities at Rattlesnake Bar. -Plan proposes to upgrade picnic facilities at Beal's Point and Folsom Point.	*1979 General Plan does not define a picnic site (table?, bbq?) and refers to "existing informal sites". State Parks does not believe there were 527 formal picnic sites in 1979.
<b>Paved Trails</b>	1979 General Plan proposed adding 9 miles of paved trail.	2 miles  (portion of paved trail from Historic Truss Bridge to Beal's Point)	Preliminary GP/RMP proposes paved trails from Dike 7 to Mormon Island Cove and around Mormon Island Preserve. (6 mi)	
<b>Dirt Trails</b>	Prior to 1979 General Plan there were 41 miles of dirt trails.  1979 General Plan proposed adding 10 miles of dirt trail (51 miles total)	59.5 miles	- Preliminary GP/RMP proposes new trails from Peninsula to Auburn SRA, at Peninsula, Sweetwater Creek and Granite Bay. -Trail bridge proposed across North Fork. -More trails possible.	
<b>Trailhead/Staging</b> These are parking areas that only serve trail use. Many other parking areas serve trail use as well.	Complete information not available.	Browns Ravine (10), Mormon Island Cove (40), Granite Bay (15), Rattlesnake Bar (20) Darrington (25), Old Salmon Falls (15), Salmon Falls (20)	Provide formalized trailhead facilities at Falconcrest, Sweetwater Creek, Horseshoe Bar, Twin Rocks/Boulder, Los Lagos, Peninsula, Dike 7, and Mormon Island Wetlands.	
<b>Other facilities</b> (activity center, multi-use facility, visitor center, etc)	1979 General Plan proposed to eliminate 138 spaces parking at Observation Pt construct picnic sites and turf.	117 vehicles total GB Activity Center (75), new Sector Public Contact Station (17) and ARWEC (25).	-Replace and enlarge the GB Activity Center. - Preliminary GP/RMP proposes a multi-use facility (boating safety center) at Browns Ravine or Folsom Pt.	Observation Pt closed to public in 2002 and is now the site of the new spillway.

<b>LAKE NATOMA</b>				
<b>Boat Ramps/Water Access</b>	Prior to 1979 General Plan there were 3 ramps.  1979 General Plan did not propose any additional ramps, the Plan did propose one dock at the Powerhouse*	3 ramps (6 docks) Negro Bar, Nimbus Flat, CSUS Aquatic Center, Willow Creek (gravel now, funded project to install paved ramp w/ dock)	-Provide hand launching at Nimbus Shoals. -Improve boat launches at Willow Creek & Negro Bar. -Expand paddling channels/lagoons at Mississippi Bar. -Support creation of instream water features for whitewater use at Nimbus Shoals.	*Powerhouse was not a designated SHP in 1979, designation occurred in 1995 and has changed management emphasis.
<b>Total Parking</b>	Prior to 1979 General Plan there was parking for 605 vehicles.  1979 General Plan proposed adding parking for 615 vehicles for a total of 1,220 parking spaces	974 total parking spaces  (includes Negro Bar, Nimbus Flat, Aquatic Center, Lake Overlook, Main Ave., Powerhouse, Parkshore, Willow Creek)	- Preliminary GP/RMP proposes additional facilities which will add parking, including day use/picnic facilities at Mississippi Bar (50-100). -Plan would reduce underutilized parking at Negro Bar and convert to other uses. -Plan proposes additional satellite special event parking.	
<b>Campgrounds</b>	Prior to 1979 General Plan - 1 family camp with 20 sites, 1 group camp with 2 sites.  1979 General Plan proposed no additional camping.	1 group campground, 3 sites	Preliminary GP/RMP proposes to shift group camping to Beal's Point and create group picnic area in the group camping location.	*20-site family camp eliminated by American River Crossing Bridge Project (Folsom Blvd). RV campground at Beal's Pt. constructed as mitigation.
<b>Picnic Sites</b>	Prior to 1979 General Plan - 96 picnic sites/tables.  1979 Plan proposed adding 194 sites or tables.	98 total picnic sites  Includes Nimbus Flat, Negro Bar, Willow Creek, Powerhouse, Lake shoreline sites.	Preliminary GP/RMP proposes additional & improved picnic facilities at Lake Overlook (5-10), Miss. Bar (25-50), Willow Creek (5-10), Negro Bar (group), Olive Grove and Powerhouse (5-10).*	*Proposed numbers are rough estimates.
<b>Trails - Paved</b>	Prior to 1979 General Plan there were no paved trails.	16 miles of paved trails.	Preliminary GP/RMP proposes completion of the paved bike loop at the Powerhouse and a	

	1979 General Plan proposed adding 8 miles of paved trail.		new paved trail corridor from Powerhouse along the canal to prison property and City trail system.	
<b>Trails - Dirt</b>	Prior to 1979 General Plan there were 8 miles of dirt trails.  1979 General Plan proposed adding 7 miles of dirt trail.	18.5 miles of dirt trails.  1.5 miles of additional trail under planning at Snipes Pershing Ravine.	-Preliminary GP/RMP proposes additional trails at Mississippi Bar.  -Additional trails are possible, detailed trail planning will occur in Trail Management Plan.	
<b>Trailheads and Staging Areas</b> These parking areas serve trail use only. Other parking areas also serve trail use.	Complete information not available.	Negro Bar Equestrian Staging (15), Main Avenue (40), Parkshore (17)	- Preliminary GP/RMP calls for improved trailhead and trail access facilities at Mississippi Bar and Lake Overlook.  - Preliminary GP/RMP calls for bicycle and trail links with RT light rail stations.	
<b>Parking at Historic Sites, Museums, Vistas</b>	Prior to 1979 General Plan there was parking for 60 vehicles for these types of facilities.  1979 General Plan proposed adding 210* parking spaces.	78 total vehicle parking spaces  Overlook (40), Powerhouse Visitor Center (28)	- Preliminary GP/RMP provides for the CIHC at Museum Flat. If, no CIHC - Plan provides for the potential for a small visitor center/multi-use facility.**  - Preliminary GP/RMP proposes multi-use (interpretive, classroom, etc) at Nimbus Flat  - Preliminary GP/RMP proposes improvements to Lake Overlook (vista area).  - Preliminary GP/RMP proposes a Negro Bar Cultural Center to interpret mining history of African-Americans and other groups.	*State Indian Museum (150 parking spaces) proposed for Lake Natoma in 1979 General Plan – but never built.  **If California Indian Heritage Center was sited at Museum Flat, it is estimated 300 parking spaces would be added.

When comparing the direction in the 1979 General Plan to the current Preliminary GP/RMP it is important to know that State Parks' approach to general plans has changed since 1979. The 1979 General Plan looked much like a subdivision map or site plan with specific details on proposed facilities including the exact number of parking spaces. Guidelines for preparing State Park General Plans are outlined in the Planning Handbook (State Parks 2002). State Parks' current approach to general plans is to provide broad programmatic direction and policies regarding land uses, indicating the general location, type and approximate scale of new proposed facilities, but not to include design details and/or specific site locations. These specific details will come out of site-specific project planning and the project level environmental analysis that will tier to the Preliminary GP/RMP and programmatic Draft EIR/EIS.

The focus for recreation in the Preliminary GP/RMP is providing high quality, day use opportunities. The Preliminary GP/RMP seeks to balance providing additional recreation opportunity and facilities with the protection of open space, natural scenery, wildlife habitat, cultural resources and other values. Folsom Lake SRA alone cannot meet the demand of current and future recreation needs in the region. The SRA is one part of the regional outdoor recreation picture.

As part of the development of the Preliminary GP/RMP, State Parks and Reclamation completed an extensive Resource Inventory of all of the resources, facilities and uses within Folsom Lake SRA, including past and current recreation use and existing recreation facilities. The Resource Inventory has been available for public review for several years and can be found at the following web site: [http://www.parks.ca.gov/?page\\_id=22741](http://www.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=22741).

A visitor intercept survey and a regional telephone survey were conducted as part of the Preliminary GP/RMP process. The purpose of the on-site visitor survey was to help characterize existing recreation use and to get the thoughts and ideas of existing users on their satisfaction with recreation opportunities and priorities for improvements. The places and times surveyed were designed to capture the broad spectrum of Folsom Lake SRA visitors. A total of 1,308 surveys were completed by visitors. Additionally, a 400-household telephone survey was also conducted in the region around the SRA. The purpose of this survey was to determine trends in outdoor recreation in the area, whether or not people visited the SRA and if not, what were the perceived barriers to using Folsom Lake SRA.

All of this information was synthesized in an "Issues and Opportunities Memorandum" which identified not only key needs and opportunities for all aspects of the SRA including

recreation use and facilities, but also constraints. The memorandum considered recreation trends and other recreation opportunities and facilities in the region. Through this analysis, public input received through public workshops and stakeholder meetings and the ideas of State Parks and Reclamation managers, the direction for recreation use and facilities was developed for the Preliminary GP/RMP.

### 3.2.3 Master Response ALT-3: Proposed “Hybrid” Alternative

In response to the perceived lack of recreational opportunities in the Preliminary GP/RMP, the City of Folsom and Placer, El Dorado and Sacramento Counties proposed a “hybrid” that would make land use designation changes in the following management zones from those proposed in Alternative 2, the Preferred Alternative:

- From Conservation to Recreation-Medium Intensity – Natoma Shore North, Natoma Shore South, Mississippi Bar, Upper Lake Natoma (aquatic), Peninsula, El Dorado Shore, Mormon Island Cove, Upper South Fork (aquatic)
- From Recreation-Medium Intensity to Recreation-High Intensity – Negro Bar, Skunk Hollow/Salmon Falls, Folsom Point

This “hybrid” alternative also includes specific desired management direction for some of these management zones.

State Parks and Reclamation have carefully considered this “hybrid” alternative. We understand that part of the rationale for the proposed changes in land use designations in the “hybrid” alternative arise from a concern for the perceived or potential limitations on recreation use and facilities of the “Conservation” land use designation. The Conservation land use designation has been modified and renamed “Low Intensity Recreation/Conservation”. The modifications to the description of this land use designation provide clarification that a range of recreation use and facilities are accommodated and provided for in these areas, but at a lower intensity than the High- and Medium-Intensity Recreation designations. The changes made in the description of this land use designation provide greater flexibility in the range of recreation facilities that can be accommodated in these areas. Specific proposals to adopt the land use designations proposed in Alternative 3 for particular management zones are addressed below. The specific proposed changes to the Preliminary GP/RMP can be found on pages 1-78 through 1-95 in Section 4.2 of this document “Recommended Changes to the Plan”.

*Natoma Shore North*

Additional direction has been provided regarding access and recreation facilities in this management zone. Specifically direction has been added to improve trail connections and pedestrian access to the City of Folsom Historic District and to consider planning for appropriate connections and public access from the City-owned Corporation yard property when it is redeveloped. See page 1-88 in Section 4.2 of this document “Recommended Changes to the Plan.”

Additional direction has also been provided to evaluate the feasibility and suitability of a dock in this management zone as part of a future site-specific planning effort. Currently, State Parks and Reclamation do not believe sufficient information and analysis has been conducted to determine if this is an appropriate location for a dock or how visitors would utilize a dock in this location. It isn't clear that there is sufficient nearby parking for boaters to utilize a dock or that people would walk boats down a steep embankment to access the dock. It is also unclear whether or not people paddling from other launch locations would leave their boats unattended at a dock in this location. Finally, this location is subject to strong current in periods of high flows (Folsom Dam releases in flood events).

In conjunction with the changes to the description of the Low Intensity Recreation/Conservation land use designation, State Parks and Reclamation believe this proposed additional direction accommodates the specific concerns expressed regarding this management zone and the land use designation. In reference to the specific request for a change in land use designation, given the narrow public land base, steep topography and other factors, State Parks and Reclamation do not believe this area is suitable for a Recreation-Medium Intensity land use designation.

*Natoma Shore South*

The Preliminary GP/RMP already accommodates many of the specific facility improvements suggested by those seeking a change in land use designation for this management zone. The Preliminary GP/RMP provides for improved picnic and boat launch facilities, and would allow a small visitor center or multi-use facility in this location if the California Indian Heritage Center is not located in this area. Additional minor changes have been made to further accommodate some of the concerns regarding additional recreation facilities in this area. Given the existing and additional facilities proposed for this area, including the potential for a California Indian Heritage Center, State Parks and Reclamation believe that a land use designation of Recreation-Medium Intensity is appropriate for this

area and this change has been made in the Plan. See page 1-89 and 1-90 in Section 4.2 of this document “Recommended Changes to the Plan”.

#### *Mississippi Bar*

The management direction in the Preliminary GP/RMP regarding Mississippi Bar has been modified to clarify the intent to retain the stable concession. The Preliminary GP/RMP already provides for improvement of the stable facilities, additional vehicle access and parking, picnic facilities, additional trails and improved trailhead and staging area facilities. The proposed changes to the management direction, along with the changes in the description of the Low Intensity Recreation/Conservation land use designation, accommodate the concerns addressed regarding this management zone while retaining the agency intent to protect and manage the natural and cultural resources in this area. Mississippi Bar is a large area, 750 acres, the majority of which is undeveloped and contains natural and cultural resources. Even with additional recreation facilities and improvements, the area will be dominated by natural and cultural resources.

#### *Negro Bar*

The Preliminary GP/RMP already provides for improved day use facilities, an improved boat launch and a cultural center. However, additional management direction has been provided for this management zone to accommodate improvements to the area including the equestrian staging area. The Recreation-Medium Intensity land use designation provided in the Preliminary GP/RMP provides sufficient flexibility for additional facilities in this area and is the appropriate designation for this management zone.

#### *Upper Lake Natoma (aquatic)*

The management direction regarding the proposal to phase out the use of gasoline engines has been modified. The new direction prohibits the use of personal water craft at Lake Natoma and will phase out the use of two-stroke engines. Because all of Lake Natoma has a 5 mph speed limit and is managed primarily for non-motorized and slow speed recreation, State Parks and Reclamation do not believe a change in land use designation is warranted for this aquatic management zone.

*Peninsula*

The management direction in the Preliminary GP/RMP already provides for doubling the campground size, extending boat ramps to serve lower lake levels, and improving trails and trailhead facilities. Additional language has been added to improve equestrian staging facilities and to consider the area as a potential location for equestrian campsites. The previously noted changes in the Conservation/Low Intensity Recreation land use designation also provide additional flexibility with regard to recreation facilities. Given the remoteness of this area, the access constraints to the area from Rattlesnake Bar Road and the fact that the management zone is a large, primarily undeveloped and important natural area, the Low Intensity Recreation/Conservation land use designation is appropriate for this area. If significant improvements are made to Rattlesnake Bar Road, which improve access to the area, this General Plan direction could be re-considered in an amendment at that time.

*Skunk Hollow/Salmon Falls*

This area is a relatively small management zone that is already at capacity with facilities and use given the existing public land base. The area is not large enough for additional facilities. The proposed land use designation in the Preferred Alternative, Recreation-Medium Intensity, is the appropriate land use designation for this management zone.

*El Dorado Shore*

The Preliminary GP/RMP already provides for improving trailhead and staging facilities at Falcon Crest and Sweetwater Creek. Language for this management zone has been added to consider developing picnic facilities in this area. The previously noted changes in the Conservation/Low Intensity Recreation land use designation also provide additional flexibility with regard to recreation facilities. The proposed land use designation in the Preliminary GP/RMP, Low Intensity Recreation/Conservation, is the appropriate land use designation for this management zone.

*Mormon Island Cove*

The Preliminary GP/RMP provides for improving trailhead and staging facilities. Additional language has been provided to permit additional facilities in this area. The previously noted changes in the Conservation/Low Intensity Recreation land use designation also provide flexibility with regard to recreation facilities. The proposed land use designation in the

Preliminary GP/RMP, Low Intensity Recreation/Conservation, is the appropriate land use designation for this management zone.

#### *Folsom Point*

The land use designation for Folsom Point has been changed from Recreation-Medium Intensity to Recreation-High Intensity. The direction in the Preliminary GP/RMP calls for improved picnic facilities and parking areas, improvements to the boat ramp additional trails and potential development of a multi-use facility. These improvements and the potential for other facilities based on alterations to the topography of the area resulting from the Joint Federal Project, warrant a change in the land use designation to Recreation-High Intensity.

#### *Upper South Fork (aquatic)*

The boating density goal for this portion of Folsom Lake has been adjusted from 50 surface acres per boat to 20-30 surface acres per boat. The boating density goal for the main body of Folsom Lake is 1 boat for every 10-20 surface acres. As noted in the Preliminary GP/RMP, implementing a 1 boat for 50 surface acre boating density goal would be a challenge given existing use and conditions. Existing use includes a mix of motorized and non-motorized users including motor boaters that gather to socialize in the 5 mph zone at New York Creek and whitewater rafts that congregate in the area around Salmon Falls in the late afternoon before taking-out after a trip down river. The new boating density goal of 1 boat per 20-30 surface acres for the Upper South Fork and North Fork Arms of Folsom Lake is a slightly lower density than the goal for the main body of the Lake (1 boat for every 10-20 surface acres) and an appropriate goal given existing use patterns. No change in the land use designation for this aquatic management zone is necessary or appropriate.

Also please see pages 1-79 to 1-80 and 1-84 to 1-85 in Section 4.2 of this document, “Recommended Changes to the Plan”.

### **3.3 COMMENTS ON CHAPTER II, EXISTING CONDITIONS**

#### **3.3.1 Master Response EC-1: California Historical Landmark #585 – Pioneer Express Trail**

State Parks will include mention of the landmark in the final plan. The landmark acknowledges the historic route used by miners. The existing recreation trail does not necessarily follow the exact route of the historic trail and the landmark does not signify that the existing recreation trail is the precise historic trail. Portions of the historic route are likely inundated by Folsom reservoir. Much more research and field work would be needed to ascertain if there are remnants of the historic route.

#### **3.3.2 Master Response EC-2: Visitor and Telephone Survey**

Visitor surveys were conducted in 2003 and 2004 as part of the GP/RMP process. The surveys were conducted by James Fletcher, PHD, a professor in the Recreation and Tourism program at California State University Chico. Mr. Fletcher also contributed to “Public Opinions and Attitudes on Outdoor Recreation in California 2002”, a State-wide survey conducted by State Parks.

Two types of surveys were conducted – the first was an on-site visitor survey. The purpose of this survey was to help characterize existing recreation use and to get the thoughts and ideas of existing users on their satisfaction with recreation opportunities and priorities for improvements. The places and times surveyed were designed to capture the broad spectrum of Folsom Lake SRA visitors. Surveys were implemented at specific locations to encounter different types of trail use including equestrians. A total of 1,308 surveys were completed by visitors. Mr. Fletcher designed the survey sample size, sampling methods and questions with input from State Parks.

The second survey was a 400-household telephone survey conducted in the region around the SRA. The purpose of this survey was to discover any trends in outdoor recreation in the area, whether or not people visited the SRA and if not why not, were there barriers to use at Folsom Lake SRA. Households were selected at random for this survey. Again Mr. Fletcher designed the survey sample size, sampling method and the questions with input from State Parks.

Although these surveys are now several years old, State Parks and Reclamation believe the results from these surveys were sufficient to provide the type of information they were intended to collect to help inform the planning effort. Again, the key purpose of the surveys was to generally characterize recreation use and trends, to get input on visitor satisfaction with existing opportunities, facilities and priorities for future development. This type of information would not change much within a few years. This level of recreation user survey and regional telephone survey for a specific park unit is more than is typically completed for State Park general plans.

The visitor and telephone surveys are just one source of information regarding recreation use and desired improvements to recreation opportunities at the SRA. Other sources of information used in the planning process include: visitor attendance data, comments received and notes from stakeholder focus group meetings and public workshops, the State Park System Plan and other State-wide recreation documents, and other public comments received during the planning process.

The report on the findings of these 2003 and 2004 surveys conducted for the Folsom Lake SRA GP/RMP is available from the Gold Fields District Office and has been made available since it was completed on the Folsom General Plan Project web pages at the following State Parks website, scroll down to the bottom of the page:

[http://www.parks.ca.gov/?page\\_id=22322](http://www.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=22322).

### **3.3.3 Master Response EC-3: Existing Equestrian Use and Facilities**

The Preliminary GP/RMP recognizes that the 100-mile trail system within the Folsom SRA is an important recreation amenity for all types of trail users, including equestrians (Preliminary GP/RMP pages II-32 & II-36). Trails and trail use are one of the key issues in the plan (Preliminary GP/RMP page II-73-75). All trail uses, including equestrian use are mentioned in each of these portions of the Preliminary GP/RMP. There is no proposal in the Preliminary GP/RMP to eliminate equestrian use or close any trails. There are no specific proposed changes in allowed use designations for trails in the Preliminary GP/RMP. The Preliminary GP/RMP is clear that decisions regarding allowed uses of trails will be made in a subsequent Trails Master Plan or Trail Management Plan.

Several staging areas were inadvertently left out of the Table EC-5 Day Use Facilities on pages II-38-40 of the Preliminary GP/RMP and these facilities and other corrections to this table have been made and will be included in the Final GP/RMP, see pages 1-74 through 1-78 of this document. Specific existing facilities that will be added to the table include the

equestrian staging area at Negro Bar, the trailhead and equestrian staging area at Browns Ravine, the equestrian staging area at Rattlesnake Bar, the trailhead and staging area at Mississippi Bar and the trailhead at Mormon Island Cove. Many of these facilities are dirt parking lots with few, if any, facilities. Nonetheless, these areas are important access points for many users and will be included in the Final GP/RMP as existing facilities.

The Sterling Point Equestrian Staging area is not located within the Folsom Lake SRA boundary and is not owned, built or maintained by State Parks or Reclamation. This Placer County facility provides access to Folsom Lake SRA trails and is an important access point for some trail users. State Parks includes the Sterling Point Staging Area in the narrative discussion of facilities, but since this is not a State Park or Reclamation facility, it will not be listed in Table EC-5 as a Folsom Lake SRA facility. There are many other trails and access points (e.g. City of Folsom trail system) that connect or provide access to Folsom Lake SRA trails that are not located within the SRA boundary and are not SRA facilities but nonetheless provide valuable access to Folsom Lake SRA trails.

Equestrian use is recognized and addressed throughout the Preliminary GP/RMP, including pages II 73-75 where equestrians are included in the discussion of trails as a key issue for the Plan. On pages II 78-97, equestrians are included in the actual direction for trails in the Plan and equestrian use is acknowledged along with other recreation uses in the discussion of existing conditions in Chapter IV, pages 260-265.

Table EC-6 of the Preliminary GP/RMP, page II-41, lists both the dirt trail and paved trail from Beal's Point to Lake Overlook/Nimbus Dam. The Pioneer Express Trail is also listed, a portion of which is also located between Beal's Point and Granite Bay. There are additional trails in the area, including a new trail re-route between Dikes 4 and 6, designed to accommodate trail use while the Dikes are closed for the ongoing Dam Safety construction work being implemented by Reclamation. Some of the trails in this area are unauthorized, user-created trails. Some of the system trails share the top of the Dikes or a common route for sections and then separate and are not easily accounted for in a table. The level of detail is sufficient for the types of direction and decisions provided for trails in the Preliminary GP/RMP. The Trail Management Plan will provide detailed maps and account for all trails within the Folsom Lake SRA.

### Map of Pioneer Express Trail

Although a trail map is not provided in the Plan, a map of the trails at Folsom Lake SRA was included in the Resource Inventory (January 2004) prepared as part of the planning process. The Resource Inventory, including the map of trails, has been available on the State Parks internet site for several years and can be accessed at the following link:  
[http://www.parks.ca.gov/?page\\_id=22741](http://www.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=22741).

Trails are discussed in Chapter II of the Preliminary GP/RMP, Existing Conditions on page II-36, including specific mention of the Pioneer Express Trail. A table listing the trails within the SRA is also included in this section on page II-41. Trail goals and guidelines provide broad direction in the Preliminary GP/RMP. Specific direction for trails will be developed in the Trails Management Plan, including updated detailed trail maps.

## **3.4 COMMENTS ON CHAPTER III, NATURAL RESOURCES AND WILDFIRE MANAGEMENT**

### **3.4.1 Master Response NR-1: Prescribed Fire**

Fire is a natural process and many of the native plant communities found within Folsom Lake SRA are fire-adapted or fire-dependent. The Preliminary GP/RMP provides for the use of prescribed fire as a vegetation management tool to help maintain native plant communities (such as chaparral and oak woodland) and to help control invasive exotic species. Prescribed fire can also help reduce the risk of wildfires by reducing fuel loads. However, the Preliminary GP/RMP also recognizes the risks of using prescribed fire and provides clear direction that prescribed fire is not suitable in all areas or at all times. Please see Preliminary GP/RMP pages III-103 to III-107. Any use of prescribed fire would occur only after a careful project specific planning process in consultation with fire suppression agencies and local jurisdictions and within a clearly defined prescription. The Preliminary GP/RMP does not provide for any specific prescribed burn, but just acknowledges this as one vegetation management tool.

## 3.5 COMMENTS ON CHAPTER III, VISITOR SERVICES, AQUATIC RECREATION

### 3.5.1 Master Response BOAT-1: Five MPH Speed Zones and “Quiet Days”

On any body of water that allows both motorized and non-motorized boat use there are likely to be some conflicts between various uses. Conflicts between motorized and non-motorized uses include concerns about noise, speed and safety and boat wakes. One proposal that came from the public to address the conflicts between motorized and non-motorized uses on Folsom Lake was to prohibit motorized use of Folsom Lake one day per week, providing a “quiet day” on Folsom Lake for non-motorized use. Others opposed this idea.

Currently, Lake Natoma is primarily managed for non-motorized and slow speed boating uses and Folsom Lake is managed to provide opportunities for all types of boating uses. There are 5 mph speed zones on both the North and South Fork Arms of Folsom Lake. Additionally, there is a 5 mph speed limit within 200 feet of the shoreline of Folsom Lake. In locations where there are specific safety issues, the State Parks District Superintendent has the authority to revise the speed regulations in order to provide for public safety without further direction in the General Plan. Folsom Lake is a long established, popular and important body of water for motorized water recreation activities. State Parks and Reclamation believe that prohibiting motorized boating use on Folsom Lake one day per week would displace too many existing users in order to accommodate the concerns of non-motorized users.

The following direction was developed in the Preliminary GP/RMP as a means of partially accommodating the concerns of members of the public advocating for “quiet days” while minimizing displacement of existing users:

*“VISIT-12: Expand the area governed by the 5 mph speed limit to the North Fork Arm of Folsom Lake in order to preserve the setting, enhance the quiet and sheltered character of the water, and reduce conflicts between motorized and non-motorized watercraft. Consider expansion of speed limit zone on South Fork Arm as appropriate.” (page III-71)*

and

*“NORTHFORK/UP-1: Extend the 5 mph zone south to Rattlesnake Bar from its current location just above Mormon Ravine. Extending the zone will reduce the effects of noise and wakes on non-motorized users from motorized watercraft traveling at high speeds in the confines of the canyon.” (page III-217)*

Below is a discussion regarding the rationale for the direction in the Preliminary GP/RMP regarding speed limits on each arm of Folsom Lake.

### North Fork Arm

Currently the 5 mph speed zone on the North Fork Arm of Folsom Lake shifts between a location about one mile downstream of Rattlesnake Bar, when Lake levels are low, to a location approximately one mile upstream of Rattlesnake Bar at higher lake levels. The speed zone line is shifted as the reservoir level drops and boating hazards emerge. The above proposal in the Preliminary GP/RMP would establish the 5 mph speed zone at higher lake levels at a location just upstream from Rattlesnake Bar in order to provide an enhanced slow speed water recreation experience on this portion of Folsom Lake. This location would allow canoeists, kayakers and other non-motorized users to launch at Rattlesnake Bar and travel upstream into a slow speed zone. However, at lower Lake levels the speed zone would be shifted downstream of Rattlesnake Bar as needed to provide for boating safety.

The North Fork Arm of Folsom Lake is approximately 9 miles long, from Doton’s Point to just downstream of Oregon Bar. At higher lake levels the existing 5mph speed zone covers approximately 2.5 miles of the North Fork Arm, at lower lake levels the existing speed zone covers about 5.5 miles of the North Fork Arm. The proposal in the Preliminary GP/RMP would extend the existing 5mph zone by 1 mile during periods of higher lake levels, covering 3.5 miles of the North Fork Arm. The majority (5.5 miles) of the North Fork Arm would remain open to higher speed motorized boat use.

State Parks and Reclamation believe the proposal in the Preliminary GP/RMP is a reasonable accommodation of the needs and concerns of non-motorized boaters on Folsom Lake with a relatively small impact on existing higher speed motorized users. Motor boats will still be able to access the entire North Fork Arm.

### South Fork Arm

Currently the 5 mph speed zone on the South Fork Arm of Folsom Lake varies between a location about one half mile downstream of the New York Creek inlet and a location about one half mile upstream of the Sweetwater Creek. This speed limit zone is moved as lake

levels fluctuate. The direction regarding the South Fork Arm speed zone in the Preliminary GP/RMP, to consider expanding this speed zone, was developed in anticipation of future problems or needs. Unlike the North Fork Arm of Folsom Lake, fewer concerns and conflicts were raised by the public regarding motorized and non-motorized boating on the South Fork Arm of Folsom Lake. Therefore this direction has been eliminated from the Preliminary GP/RMP, see page 1-79 and 1-84 to 1-85 of this document.

### **3.5.2 Master Response BOAT-2: Gasoline Boat Engines on Lake Natoma**

The Preliminary GP/RMP provides the following proposed direction regarding the use of gasoline boat engines on Lake Natoma:

*VISIT-13: Phase out the use of gasoline engines on Lake Natoma to preserve the setting and character of the lake, enhance the visitor experience, and solidify the role of the lake as a premier paddling/rowing destination. Exceptions would be made for emergency response vessels and vessels necessary for other administrative purposes. (Pg. III-71 of the Preliminary GP/RMP)*

and

*NATOMA/UP-2: Limit public use of motorized watercraft on Lake Natoma to electric trolling motors only to reduce noise and water pollution, and continue the 5 mph speed limit for motorized watercraft for the entire lake. (Pg. III-161 of the Preliminary GP/RMP)*

Currently Lake Natoma is managed for non-motorized and slow speed water recreation uses including paddling, rowing, swimming and fishing. It is well known and accepted that there is a long established 5mph speed limit on the entire Lake. It is less known that the existing regulation, which establishes the 5mph speed limit on the entire Lake, also prohibits the use of gas engines on the lower half of Lake Natoma from Willow Creek to Nimbus Dam. Under the current regulation, this portion of the Lake is available only for electric trolling motors.

The intent of the direction in the Preliminary GP/RMP is to eliminate the noise and pollution of gasoline engines on Lake Natoma to enhance the experience of non-motorized users and provide consistent direction for the entire Lake. In doing so, State Parks does not wish to displace existing uses of Lake Natoma such as fishing from boats. Some members of

the public expressed concern that electric trolling motors may not have sufficient power to navigate upstream against the current above Rainbow Bridge.

The direction in the Preliminary GP/RMP regarding motorized boat use on Lake Natoma has been modified. Lake Natoma will continue to be managed for slow speed and non-motorized water recreation. The existing 5 mph speed limit for motorized watercraft for the entire Lake will continue. The use of personal water craft will be prohibited on Lake Natoma. The use of high emission two-stroke engines on Lake Natoma will be phased out. California Air Resources Board emissions standards for boat engines will be utilized in developing standards for the phase out of two-stroke engines on Lake Natoma.

### **3.5.4 Master Response BOAT-3: Boat Launch Ramps**

The Preliminary GP/RMP provides direction to extend or improve boat ramps to provide increased access at under-served lake levels, particularly lower lake levels (pages III-73 – III-74 of the Preliminary GP/RMP). The direction in the Preliminary GP/RMP indicates that extension or expansion of ramps will be consistent with vehicle access, parking, environmental concerns and lake capacity thresholds. Some of the current congestion at day use areas is due to insufficient lane capacity at existing ramps. Expanding ramps will help alleviate this congestion. At lake levels below 420' lake elevation, the Lake still provides for all types of boating opportunities, but there is insufficient boat launching capacity to meet demand. As the lake level drops the quality of experience for boating users and the desirability of boating on Folsom Lake is somewhat diminished, however there is still demand for boat launching. When lake levels approach 390' in elevation State Parks imposes a 5 mph speed limit on all of Folsom Lake to provide for visitor safety due to the many underwater hazards. These factors will be considered in developing proposals to extend boat ramps. Improvements to ramps could occur at all of the existing ramp facilities including Rattlesnake Bar, Granite Bay, Folsom Point and Browns Ravine.

Additionally boat ramp improvements are proposed for Negro Bar and Willow Creek on Lake Natoma. For these facilities at Lake Natoma, small ramps and low float docks would be utilized to serve non-motorized and slow speed uses of the lake.

## **3.6 COMMENTS ON CHAPTER III, VISITOR SERVICES, CAMPING**

### **3.6.1 Master Response CAMP-1: Camping**

The Preliminary GP/RMP indicates the primary emphasis for recreation use and facilities at Folsom Lake SRA is providing diverse high quality day use facilities. One of the reasons for this emphasis is its proximity to a large metropolitan population center and the close proximity of residential development around much of the SRA. However, the Preliminary GP/RMP does propose some improvements to and expansions of existing camping facilities, such as shifting group camping from Negro Bar to Beal's Point and enlarging the Peninsula campground by 50-100 sites. One issue regarding the expansion of camping facilities at the Peninsula is the condition of Rattlesnake Bar Road, a County road, from Pilot Hill to the Peninsula area. Additionally, direction has been added to the Preliminary GP/RMP to consider options for equestrian camping and bike-in camping. See page 1-80 of this document, Section 4.2, "Recommended Changes to the Preliminary GP/RMP".

The State Park System Plan, which documents the need for additional camping facilities State-wide, is specifically addressed in the issue analysis regarding camping on page III-78-79 of the Preliminary GP/RMP.

## **3.7 COMMENTS ON CHAPTER III, VISITOR SERVICES, TRAILS**

### **3.7.1 Master Response TR-1: Trail Enforcement**

Folsom Lake SRA is unique within the State Park System, a large, complex and heavily visited park unit in the midst of an urban and suburban region which experiences many of the same law enforcement challenges, crimes and public safety concerns that cities and counties face. These challenges include car burglaries, assaults, drug dealing, drowning and DUI. State Parks focuses patrols by State Park Rangers in areas with the greatest degree of public use and where the most serious law enforcement problems occur, which often tend to be high use areas such as campgrounds, picnic areas and day use areas. Unfortunately, this means that there is less time spent for patrol of trails by State Park Rangers. State Parks acknowledges that it would be desirable to have a greater patrol presence on trail by State Park Rangers, however, this may not be possible given the number of State Park Ranger positions allocated to Folsom Lake SRA.

Even with increased patrol presence by State Park Rangers, they cannot be everywhere at once and patrol of the trails by State Park staff will be imperfect. Increased enforcement alone will not assure compliance of trail rules and etiquette by all trail users. State Parks finds that the strategy to gain the greatest compliance with trail rules and etiquette includes developing a trail system that provides equitable access for all trail users, providing good information on allowed uses and trail etiquette through trail signs and other informational materials, enforcement of rules and regulations to the extent feasible and peer pressure by various trail users groups to enforce trail rules and appropriate trail etiquette among group members.

### **3.7.2 Master Response TR-2: Dogs Off-Leash**

The current regulation (CA Code of Regulations Title 14, 4312) for dogs at Folsom Lake SRA is that dogs are required to be under control and on-leash at all times. This regulation can be a challenge to enforce. State Park Rangers enforce the leash requirement when they observe dogs off-leash. In areas where specific problems have occurred, State Parks has implemented focused patrols and enforcement of the leash rules. State Parks does install signs regarding the leash requirement at various locations. It is possible to install additional signs as needed.

### **3.7.3 Master Response TR-3: Trail Maintenance**

The Folsom Lake SRA trail system is in need of greater attention and resources devoted to trail maintenance. The amount of funding provided to the District annually for maintenance of all facilities, including trails, is insufficient to keep up with the maintenance needs of recreation facilities. Because trails are a dispersed and less visible type of facility, they do not always receive the attention and resources that more developed facilities receive. This problem is not unique to Folsom Lake SRA, but is a challenge across the State Park system.

The development of a Trail Management Plan will help in documenting specific trail maintenance needs and in classifying and prioritizing trails for maintenance. The Plan will be a tool which will help the District trails program better compete for the limited funding available for trail maintenance and better position the District to obtain outside funding sources for trail maintenance.

### **3.7.4 Master Response TR-4: Trail Signs**

The Preliminary GP/RMP provides direction to address trail signing needs as part of the development of the Trails Management Plan on page III-80.

### **3.7.5 Master Response TR-5: Trail Types**

Many people provided comments either in support or in opposition to developing more multiple-use trails or other specific types of trails (mountain bike trails, equestrian trails). State Parks and Reclamation recognize that there are strong divergent opinions regarding the desirability of multi-use trails and specifically for trails shared by equestrian users and mountain bikers. State Parks policy (Department Notice 2005-06) regarding trails is to meet the recreational, education and interpretation needs of diverse trail users and to consider multi-use trails and trail connectivity when developing trail plans or individual trails. One of the twelve program goals of the “California Recreation Trails Plan, Phase 1 (June 2002)”, developed by the Department, is to provide the maximum opportunities for public use of trails by encouraging the appropriate expansion of multi-use trails. Multi-use trails provide access to the broadest range of users. Sharing trails with different types of uses can alter the experience for trail users. Not all trails, locations or situations are suitable for multi-use trails.

State Parks and Reclamation also recognize that many people expressed support or opposition for creating additional trails for specific types of uses or allowing or restricting access of specific types of users to existing trails.

The Preliminary GP/RMP does not make any specific decisions regarding allowed uses on trails. These types of decisions and any changes to the existing allowed uses of trails will be made initially through the development of the Trail Management Plan and the State Parks Trail Use Change Process.

### **3.7.6 Master Response TR-6: Specific New Trails and Trail Connections**

A number of people expressed support for the development of a multi-use trail around both Folsom Lake and Lake Natoma. The Preliminary GP/RMP includes a goal to provide a trail loop around Folsom Lake and Lake Natoma. The specific development of the trails needed to complete these recreation trail loops will be detailed in the Trail Management Plan. The

specific allowed uses of these future trails would be determined in the Trails Management Plan and during site specific trail planning.

Others expressed support for providing a trail bridge across the North Fork Canyon. The Preliminary GP/RMP provides direction for accommodating a trail bridge to serve as the crossing of the Auburn to Cool Trail, which is primarily located within Auburn SRA, if site specific planning determines such a bridge is feasible. The Preliminary GP/RMP also provides direction for determining the feasibility of providing a trail bridge that could connect existing and future trails within Folsom Lake SRA on the north and south sides of the North Fork Arm of Folsom Lake. It is possible that depending upon the location, a single trail bridge could serve both these purposes.

Several people expressed support for providing a trail that would connect to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) trail system at Cronin Ranch along the South Fork of the American River. The Preliminary GP/RMP provides direction (area specific direction for the Skunk Hollow/Salmon Falls Management Zone) to work with the BLM and others to provide a connection between the Folsom Lake SRA trail system and the proposed trail along the South Fork of the American River.

Lastly, a few people expressed support for providing a new trail along the North Fork Arm of Folsom Lake that would connect the Peninsula to the Olmstead Loop in Auburn SRA. In the area specific direction for the North Fork Shore Management Zone, the Preliminary GP/RMP provides for the development of a new trail that would connect Peninsula to the Knickerbocker Flat area (the Olmstead Loop).

### **3.7.7 Master Response TR-7: Trail Safety**

The Preliminary GP/RMP expresses a broad goal of providing a trail system and program that promotes trail safety and etiquette. Trail safety involves many elements, including: appropriate trail design guidelines for the alignment, construction and maintenance of trails; adequate information and signage regarding trail rules and etiquette; and acceptance and adherence to trail rules (including allowed uses and speed) and etiquette by all trail users. Another aspect of trail safety is for trail users to consider the level of challenge or types of uses allowed on a particular trail given their experience and skill level and the experience of their horse. State Parks looks forward to working with all trail user groups to implement meaningful ways to promote trail safety through the development and implementation of the Trails Management Plan.

Trail user safety is a key consideration in developing multi-use trails, including providing adequate sight distance, sufficient trail width for users to pass one another and a trail design that encourages slower speeds for bikes. These and other factors will be considered in developing new multi-use trails and in any future changes proposed for an existing trail.

### **3.7.8 Master Response TR-8: Use of Volunteers**

The Folsom Lake Trail Patrol is an existing group of approximately 70 volunteers that provides valuable assistance to State Parks in patrol of the trails. This group is currently comprised of equestrian volunteers. The Preliminary GP/RMP provides a guideline to develop a multi-disciplinary volunteer trail patrol that would include bicycle and pedestrian users as well (page III-87, Preliminary GP/RMP).

A number of groups currently work with State Parks on trail maintenance projects, as part of special work days such as Earth Day and on specific projects. Additionally, State Parks has developed an Adopt-a-Trail program for the paved bicycle trail around Lake Natoma. State Parks recognizes there is a lot of interest from user groups in assisting with trail maintenance. Utilizing these groups requires State Parks staff time and not all types of trail maintenance are suitable for volunteers. The goals and guidelines in the Preliminary GP/RMP to establish a trail coordinator position and develop a Trail Management Plan should help State Parks to better utilize volunteers for trail projects.

### **3.7.9 Master Response TR-9: Night Mountain Bike Riding**

The current park hours are from 6am to 9pm during daylight savings time and from 7am to 7pm during the non-daylight savings time period. State Parks staff open and close gates in the developed use areas according to these park hours. Agency managers recognize that the park is an important recreation amenity for many people in the area, including those who use the trails and other facilities as part of a regular or daily fitness regime. Many factors go into determining the park hours including hours of daylight, staffing and other resources. The hours of operation are not established in the GP/RMP, but are a decision for which the District or Sector Superintendent has authority to establish based on these many factors. Some requests for evening use outside the park hours of operation may be considered on a case-by-case basis through the unit special events program.

### **3.7.10 Master Response TR-10: Trail Management Plan**

The Preliminary GP/RMP indicates that a Trails Master Plan (or synonymously a Trail Management Plan) will be developed that will guide the management of the trail system. State Parks has begun gathering information that will be needed for the preparation of a Trail Management Plan. This information includes compiling GPS data for all trails and developing a GIS map of the trail system. State Parks hopes to initiate the development of the Trail Management Plan shortly after the completion of this Preliminary GP/RMP and Draft EIR/EIS process. The development of the Trail Management Plan will include multiple opportunities for all trail users, including representatives of trail user group organizations, adjacent jurisdictions and agencies that have an interest in the Folsom Lake SRA trail system, park neighbors and others in participating in the preparation of this specific management plan. The specific format for public involvement has not yet been determined.

### **3.7.11 Master Response TR-11: Equestrian Facilities**

The Preliminary GP/RMP is intended to provide broad direction in the form of goals and guidelines for trails but does not list all potential facility additions or specific improvements. The direction in the Preliminary GP/RMP (page III-80) indicates that specific new facilities and enhancements will be identified in a subsequent Trail Master Plan. State Parks and Reclamation are supportive of making improvements to many existing trail facilities, including trailheads and equestrian staging areas. The Preliminary GP/RMP specifically addresses improvements to the informal trail access at Mississippi Bar (III-136-137), Falcon Crest and Sweetwater Creek (page III-195). Additional direction will be provided in the Final GP/RMP to make improvements at other existing trailhead and staging areas including Mississippi Bar, the Granite Bay Staging Area, the Rattlesnake Bar Staging Area, Peninsula and Negro Bar. See Section 4.2 of this document “Recommended Changes to the Preliminary GP/RMP.”

Some people commenting on the Preliminary GP/RMP requested that equestrian camping facilities be provided for in the Preliminary GP/RMP. Areas suggested for this type of facility were Peninsula, Rattlesnake Bar, Mississippi Bar and Monte Vista or Falconcrest off of Salmon Falls Road.

State Parks is willing to explore the possibility of developing camping facilities suitable for equestrian users and is including direction in the Preliminary GP/RMP to this effect. See page 1-80 in Section 4.2 of this document, “Recommended Changes to the Preliminary

GP/RMP”. Some of the locations suggested for equestrian camping are more suitable than others. As an example, State Parks does not believe that the Monte Vista site is the most suitable location for camping facilities due to the proximity to adjacent residential areas. As with any facility proposed in the Preliminary GP/RMP, the actual development of such a facility will require further project-specific planning and environmental analysis and would be contingent on funding, staffing levels and other operational considerations.

### 3.7.12 Master Response TR-12: Trail Use

The Preliminary GP/RMP does not make any specific decisions about allowed uses on trails. The Preliminary GP/RMP indicates that these decisions will be made in a Trails Master Plan. The Preliminary GP/RMP does provide trail designation descriptions (and other trails direction in the Plan) in order to serve as a broad framework for making specific decisions in the Trails Master Plan. The Preliminary GP/RMP includes descriptions of five types of trails:

- Shared Use Paved Trail – Class 1 Bike Path;
- Shared Use Dirt Trail;
- Shared Use Dirt Trail – Alternating Day/Time Separation Option;
- Limited Use Trail; and
- Fully Accessible Trail.

The Preliminary GP/RMP guidelines provide information regarding the typical or desired location, access, terrain, use characteristics and visitor experience (difficulty/challenge) for these different types of trails.

Many people commented on the portion of the Preliminary GP/RMP regarding trail designation (page III-82-85) and specifically the direction for the “Shared-Use Dirt Trail – Alternating Day/Time Separation Option” (page III-83). Equestrian users commenting on the Preliminary GP/RMP opposed this concept of using some type of alternating days or times to accommodate different types of users on the same trail. Mountain bike users commenting on the plan generally expressed support for this idea. Some people requested

that a “multiple-use trail corridor” or “parallel limited use trails” be included as trail designation types.

State Parks direction regarding Trail Management Plans and decision-making tools for trails have evolved since the Folsom Lake SRA Preliminary GP/RMP was initiated. The definition and description of trail designations in the Preliminary GP/RMP is a mixture of the physical attributes of different types of trails designed for specific purposes (paved surface for bicycles, fully accessible trails) and different strategies and tools to manage use on these trails (limited use, multiple use, alternating days).

In order to provide clearer direction in the Plan, State Parks is revising the trail designation section of the Preliminary GP/RMP. See page 1-81 through 1-83 of Section 4.2 of this document, “Recommended Changes to the Preliminary GP/RMP”. The following types of trails are recognized and described in this revised direction: paved bicycle trails (some with shoulders of native materials), dirt trails designated for multiple-use (equestrians, bikes and pedestrians), dirt trails designated for limited use (pedestrian/equestrian or bicycle/equestrian) and fully accessible trails.

These trail type descriptions in the Preliminary GP/RMP provide a broad framework and criteria for further decision-making in the Trail Management Plan. As part of the Trail Management Plan, all trails will be classified for developing maintenance standards and priorities. Factors to be considered in these trail classifications will include types of uses, proximity to other facilities, access and connection, and use patterns.

The trails within the Folsom Lake SRA all have existing designated allowed uses. These designations for allowed use have occurred over time in various ways including existing/historical use and new trails developed for specific purposes. In the Trail Management Plan, existing allowed uses on the Folsom Lake SRA trails will be assessed and any changes to the allowed uses will be considered as part of that specific trail plan. Many factors need to be considered in making changes to allowed uses including: trail condition, trail use, safety, location and many other factors. State Parks has developed tools to assess any proposed change in allowed use.

Many potential strategies are available to accommodate and provide access to different types of trail users. Implementing a scenario to allow different trail uses on alternating days on a given trail is one potential management strategy and is not a specific trail classification. Likewise a decision to build separate, parallel, limited use trails or multi-use trail corridors is another management option. The Preliminary GP/RMP is not adopting or precluding any of

these or other potential management strategies. Specific decisions on whether or not to utilize a particular management strategy on a particular trail would be made through the Trails Management Plan or similar planning process. For specific changes to the Trail Designation portion of the Unit-wide Trails direction in the Preliminary GP/RMP, see Section 4.2 of this document, “Recommended Changes to the Preliminary GP/RMP”.

### **3.7.13 Master Response TR-13: Access from Adjacent Private Property**

The following direction is provided in the unit-wide direction within the Preliminary GP/RMP:

*VISIT-47: Provide sufficient access to the SRA trail system to adequately serve the public and to discourage the creation of unauthorized and individual access points by adjacent neighbors. Establish new access points as appropriate by formalizing and improving existing informal access points.*

*Visit-65: Eliminate existing unauthorized access points and connections to the trail system from adjacent private property. Monitor the SRA’s urban boundaries to prevent the establishment of new unauthorized access to the trail system.*

and

*CIRCULATE-8: Eliminate informal and illegal access to the SRA from private property.*

The Folsom Lake SRA is surrounded by residential development. In most locations the boundary of Reclamation and State Parks lands is marked by a t-post and 3-strand wire fence. The purpose of the boundary fence is not to keep people out – but to inform people of the boundary between private property and public lands.

Park visitors can go anywhere within the Folsom Lake SRA during the hours of operation – State Parks doesn’t want to keep people out of the Folsom Lake SRA. State Parks develops public access points to accommodate visitor access to the Folsom Lake SRA. State Parks’ prefers and encourages park visitors to use these developed access points to ensure public safety and the protection of resources.

State Parks knows that most of the adjacent neighbors value the SRA and respect the public lands. State Parks expects that neighbors are respecting the boundary and are not modifying

the boundary fence or making physical modifications to public lands without permission from the agencies managing these lands. The direction in the Preliminary GP/RMP regarding access from adjacent private property has been modified to clarify the intent of this direction. See Section 4.2 of this document, “Recommended Changes to the Preliminary GP/RMP”.

Problems arise when adjacent property owners make unauthorized improvements or modifications to the public facilities and public lands. These modifications can include cutting the SRA boundary fence (which is located on public lands), installing gates in the SRA boundary fence, constructing unauthorized trails on public land from private property to the system trails, spraying herbicides on vegetation in the public lands, extending gardens onto the public land or making other improvements on public land. It is illegal to cut trees or destroy vegetation on public lands or to modify public structures on public lands without the permission of the managing agencies – and this has always been the case.

If members of the public, groups, neighborhoods or communities believe there is insufficient public access to the park unit, State Parks is willing to engage in discussions with these groups and consider developing additional public access points in appropriate locations.

### **3.7.14 Master Response TR-14: New Trail Underpass**

State Parks and Reclamation recognize the paved trail underpass for the new entrance road into the Reclamation and State Parks administrative facilities located between the San Juan Water District facilities and Folsom Dam Road is insufficient in height and width for mounted equestrians to ride through the underpass. However, this is not a general plan issue. The new entrance road and underpass were constructed as part of the new Folsom Dam Bridge Project, which was analyzed under a separate environmental review process in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The City of Folsom and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers are the lead agencies for this project. The City and the Corps, in consultation with State Parks and Reclamation, are working on providing a bypass to the underpass to allow safe passage for equestrians.

### **3.7.15 Master Response TR-15: Motorized and Non-Motorized Use of Trails**

No legal motorized use of any of the trails within Folsom Lake SRA exists at present and there is no proposal in the Preliminary GP/RMP to accommodate motorized use of trails. Occasionally, people on motorcycles, all terrain vehicles or four-wheel drive vehicles drive illegally on trails within the Folsom Lake SRA. State Park Rangers respond to these incidents when we become aware of this illegal use and State Parks assesses ways to prevent this illegal use. The Preliminary GP/RMP provides direction regarding off-road use below the high pool level of Folsom Lake (pages III-101 – III-102).

### **3.7.16 Master Response TR-16: Trail Connectivity and Non-Motorized Access**

The Preliminary GP/RMP provides specific direction regarding connectivity and coordinating trail planning and development with other adjacent trail systems and public transit (pages III-81 and III-86). State Parks currently works closely with the City of Folsom and other agencies on connections between trail systems. The Preliminary GP/RMP also provides direction to work with Regional Transit to coordinate linkage of the RT stations adjacent to the SRA and pedestrian and bicycle facilities (page III-136). Broad direction to provide bicycle facilities to encourage bicycling and other alternate modes of transportation is provided on page III-91 of the Preliminary GP/RMP.

## **3.8 COMMENTS ON CHAPTER III, UNIT-WIDE SERVICES, MULTI-USE FACILITIES**

### **3.8.1 Master Response MUF-1: Multi-Use Facility at Brown's Ravine**

The Preliminary GP/RMP proposes developing a new multi-use facility at Folsom Lake for the purpose of water safety training focused on motorized use and Browns Ravine and Folsom Point are suggested as potential locations in the Plan. Some people provided comment that the multi-use facility should be located at Browns Ravine due to the existing marina and other facilities. State Parks will take these factors into consideration when specific planning for the multi-use facility occurs. At this point for the purpose of the Preliminary GP/RMP, some flexibility in the potential location of the facility is desirable and no changes to the Preliminary GP/RMP have been made regarding this issue.

## **3.9 COMMENTS ON CHAPTER III, UNIT-WIDE OPERATIONS**

### **3.9.1 Master Response UWO-1: Land Acquisition**

Reclamation is not authorized to acquire additional lands to add to the existing federal property within Folsom Lake SRA. Since State Parks began managing Folsom Lake SRA in 1956, the State has acquired approximately 2,200 acres of land adjacent to the Federal property to be included as part of the Folsom Lake SRA. These acquisitions have been made both to provide additional recreation opportunities and facilities and to protect natural and cultural resources. The Preliminary GP/RMP provides broad direction on the goals and purposes of land acquisition (pages III-100 to III-101) and identifies areas with specific needs for additional land acquisition such as the Salmon Falls/Skunk Hollow Management Zone (page III-191). Consistent with the direction in the Preliminary GP/RMP, State Parks will continue to consider acquisition opportunities which help meet the needs and goals of the park unit.

### **3.9.2 Master Response UWO-2: User Fees**

User fees are established at a State-wide level. Districts have some discretion on locations to implement fees and fee pricing within the range established at a State-wide level. User fees are generally not an issue addressed in a General Plan.

## **3.10 COMMENTS ON CHAPTER III – SPECIFIC AREA GOALS AND GUIDELINES, MISSISSIPPI BAR**

### **3.10.1 Master Response MB-1: Horse Stable Concession (Shadow Glen)**

The Preliminary GP/RMP provides direction to emphasize trail access and public recreation in the stable operation, but not the boarding of horses. The direction in the Preliminary GP/RMP also indicates the boarding stables at Mississippi Bar would be phased out and that this might occur if the current concessionaire decided to vacate the concession or when the current concession contract expired.

The purpose of the State Parks concession program is to provide recreation access, services or opportunities that State Parks is not able to provide. The stable concession provides

access to trails and trail riding opportunities. The boarding of privately owned horses provides trail access and recreation opportunity for a limited number of people, not unlike boat slips at the marina. State Parks believes that the trail riding opportunities that the concession provides to the public at large is a key element of the concession operation.

To address the public concerns regarding the direction in the Preliminary GP/RMP, State Parks and Reclamation propose to change the direction in the Final GP/RMP, described below. The revisions to the Preliminary GP/RMP will provide direction to continue to provide the opportunity for a boarding stable, horse rental and trail riding concession at Mississippi Bar. Direction is also provided to make improvements to the stable facilities as part of a long-term concession contract, including the potential for a small equestrian camping facility. If the existing concessionaire decides to vacate the concession and no replacement is found to operate the facility, the area of the stables would be used for equestrian staging, parking, trailhead access and other day use facilities. See page 1-85 and 1-86 in Section 4.2 of this document, “Recommended Changes to the Preliminary GP/RMP”.

### **3.11 COMMENTS ON CHAPTER IV – ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS**

#### **3.11.1 Master Response EIR/EIS-1: Qualifications of EIR/EIS Preparers**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines do not specifically require that the street addresses, specific academic degrees, state licenses, professional society certifications, and other professional information of EIR preparers be provided; nor do they specify in what part of the document this information should be placed. CEQA Guidelines Section 15129, Organizations and Persons Consulted, states that: “*An EIR shall identify all federal, state, or local agencies, other organizations, and private individuals consulted in preparing the draft EIR, and the persons, firms, or agency preparing the draft EIR, by contract or other authorization.*” This information is already provided in Sections 4.10 and in Appendix G of the joint Preliminary GP/RMP and Draft EIR/EIS document. However, specific information of the Draft EIR/EIS preparers is provided below in response to comments requesting this information.

The Draft EIR/EIS was prepared by LSA Associates, Inc. by staff in the Point Richmond (157 Park Place, Pt. Richmond, CA 94801), Irvine (20 Executive Park, Suite 200, Irvine, CA 92614), Rocklin (4200 Rocklin Blvd., Suite 11B, Rocklin, CA 95677), and Fort Collins (132 W. Mountain, Fort Collins, CO 80524) offices. The preparation of the Draft EIR/EIS was based primarily on the *Draft Resource Inventory for the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area* (Wallace,

Roberts, and Todd, LLC.; LSA Associates, Inc.; Geotechnical Consultants, Inc.; Psomas; Concept Marine Associates, Inc.; 2003), available online at: [http://www.parks.ca.gov/?page\\_id=22741](http://www.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=22741)>. Specific qualifications of the Draft EIR/EIS preparers are as follows:

Bill Mayer, Principal Environmental Planner. B.S., Urban Planning, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, CA; 35 years of environmental planning experience. Contribution: Project management and project coordination.

Laura Lafler, Principal Environmental Planner. M.L.A., Landscape Architecture and Environmental Planning, 1980, Univ. of Calif., Berkeley, CA; 31 years of environmental planning experience. Contribution: Project management and project coordination.

Shanna Guiler, Senior Planner. M.U.E.P., Urban and Environmental Planning, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA; 7 years of environmental planning experience. Contribution: Wrote Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement.

Kristen Granback, Planner. B.S., Environmental Studies/Conservation and Resource Management, San Francisco State University, San Francisco, CA; 3 years of environmental planning experience. Contribution: Wrote Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Report.

George Molnar, Associate Biologist. M.S., Plant Ecology, 1990, Florida International University, Miami, FL; 33 years of biology experience. Contribution: Technical review of biology section of Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Report.

Christian Gerike, Principal Cultural Resources Manager/Registered Professional Archaeologist. M.A. 2005, Cultural Resources Management, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, CA; 30 years of cultural resource management experience. Contribution: Technical review of cultural resources section of Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Report.

George McKale, Associate Cultural Resource Manager/Registered Professional Archaeologist. M.A., Cultural Resources Management, 1999, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, CA; 14 years of cultural resource management experience. Contribution: Wrote cultural resources section of Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Report.

Andy Pulcheon, Associate Cultural Resources Manager/Registered Professional Archaeologist/Registered Professional Historian/Certified Planner. M.A., Cultural Resources Management, 2000, Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, CA; 14 years of cultural resource management experience. Contribution: Wrote cultural resources section of Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Report.

Tony Petros, Principal Traffic Specialist. Candidate Master of Regional Planning, 1985, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY; 28 years of air quality experience. Contribution: Technical review of traffic section of Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Report.

Meghan Macias, Associate/Senior Transportation Planner. Master of Urban and Regional Planning, 1998, University of California, Irvine, CA; 11 years of transportation planning experience. Contribution: Wrote traffic and transportation section of Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Report.

Tony Chung, Principal/Director of Acoustical and Air Quality Services. Ph.D., Mechanical Engineering, 1991, University of California, Los Angeles, CA; 22 years of acoustical and air quality experience. Contribution: Technical review of air quality and noise sections of Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Report.

Ronald Brugger, Senior Air Quality Specialist. B.S., Mechanical Engineering, 1983, University of Wisconsin-Madison, WI; 25 years of air quality experience. Contribution: Wrote air quality section of Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Report.

# CHAPTER 4.0 – RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE PRELIMINARY GP/RMP AND DRAFT EIR/EIS

## 4.1 INTRODUCTION

Chapter 4.0 presents specific changes to the text of the Preliminary GP/RMP and Draft EIR/EIS that are being made to clarify any errors, omissions, or misinterpretations of materials in these documents in response to comments received during the public review period. In no case, do these revisions result in a greater number of impacts or impacts of a greater severity than those set forth in the Draft EIR/EIS. Where revisions to the main text are called for, the page and section are set forth, followed by the appropriate revision. Added text is indicated by underlined text. Text deleted from the Preliminary GP/RMP and Draft EIR/EIS is shown in ~~strikeout~~. Page numbers correspond to the page numbers in the Preliminary GP/RMP and Draft EIR/EIS (November 2007).

## 4.2 RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE PRELIMINARY GP/RMP

### 4.2.1 Executive Summary Added

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### PARK DESCRIPTIONS

Folsom Lake State Recreation Area (SRA) and Folsom Powerhouse State Historic Park (SHP) are located at the confluence of the North and South Forks of the American River in the Sierra Nevada Foothills at the eastern edge of the Sacramento metropolitan region. Encompassing approximately 19,500 acres of water and land, the SRA extends across the boundaries of three counties (El Dorado, Placer, and Sacramento) as well as the City of Folsom and the communities of Orangevale, El Dorado Hills and Granite Bay. Folsom Lake SRA and Folsom Powerhouse SHP are composed of both Federal lands and waters (17,300

acres) administered by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) and State-owned lands (2,200 acres) acquired by the California Department of Parks and Recreation (State Parks). The Federal lands in both units are managed by State Parks through a lease agreement with Reclamation.

## **Folsom Lake SRA**

Situated within the westernmost extent of the Sierra Nevada Foothills, the Folsom Lake SRA landscape consists of two reservoirs—Folsom Lake and Lake Natoma—surrounded by rolling oak-studded foothills, upland plateaus and deep river canyons carved by the North and South Forks of the American River. The dams and reservoirs were created as part of the Central Valley Water Project and the primary function of the reservoirs is to provide flood control, water supply and power generation. The two reservoirs are the unit’s dominant physical features.

Folsom Lake, the larger of the two reservoirs, includes roughly 11,500 surface acres at full pool and over 75 miles of undulated shoreline that provides numerous and varied opportunities for water-dependent and land-based recreation activities and support facilities. Lake Natoma, an afterbay of Folsom Dam and Reservoir, is located about one mile below Folsom Dam. The long, narrow lake includes approximately 540 surface acres and 14 miles of highly scenic riparian shoreline and also displays the effects of past mining activities in the form of cobblestone dredge tailing piles up to several stories high.

With an average of 1.5 million visitors over the past five years, the Folsom Lake SRA is one of the most popular units in the State Parks system. This popularity is due largely to the location of the SRA within a growing metropolitan area, good highway access, and opportunities for use year-round – although 75 percent of all visits occur during the warmer spring and summer months. Recreation facilities within the SRA include a marina, boat launch areas, swimming beaches, campgrounds, landscaped picnic areas, food and equipment concessions, interpretive facilities, scenic overlooks, restrooms, trailhead facilities and more than 90 miles of dirt trails and paved paths. Popular aquatic activities in the SRA include boating, personal water craft use, water skiing, wake boarding, sailing, rafting, rowing, paddling, swimming, and fishing. Upland activities include hiking, biking, picnicking, camping, and horseback riding. Lake Natoma is primarily managed for non-motorized and slow speed aquatic recreation use such as rowing, paddling and fishing. The Sacramento State Aquatic Center is located on Lake Natoma and functions through an operating agreement between State Parks and the university.

The SRA supports nine major vegetation communities typical of the lower foothills of California's Central Valley, including blue oak woodland/savanna, interior live oak woodland, chemise chaparral and annual grasslands. These communities provide habitat for a diverse mix of terrestrial and aquatic fauna, including several special status species.

As a cultural resource, the SRA is rich in history spanning more than 4,000 years and contains at least 229 known archaeological sites that are both prehistoric and historic in nature. Mining, settlement, and water development are dominant themes associated with the historic archaeological sites identified within the SRA. Remnants of buildings, roads, bridges and ditches associated with these historic activities can be found throughout the SRA. Many of the cultural sites are located below the full pool level of Folsom Lake and some of these sites get exposed at low lake levels.

### **Folsom Powerhouse SHP**

The thirty five-acre Folsom Powerhouse State Historic Park (SHP) is located adjacent to Folsom Lake SRA along the southern shoreline of Lake Natoma. The Powerhouse was managed as a portion of Folsom Lake SRA until 1995 when it was classified as a separate unit within the State Park System to acknowledge the special historical significance of the site. The Folsom Powerhouse represents one of the oldest hydroelectric facilities in the world and the nation's first power system to provide high-voltage alternating current over long distance transmission lines. The historic structures that form the core of the SHP include the main powerhouse and turbine room, the pump room, transformers and switches, the lower powerhouse, the blacksmith shop, forebay, spillways and about one half mile of the canal that once brought water to the Powerhouse from the original Folsom Dam. The Folsom Powerhouse is listed on the National Register of Historic Places. It is also listed as a California Historical Landmark, National Historic Landmark, National Historic Civil Engineering Landmark, and National Historic Mechanical Engineering Landmark.

Visitor service facilities at the SHP include a small picnic area, walking paths, restrooms, a small paved parking area and a modest visitor center constructed in 2007. Folsom Powerhouse SHP provides tours, exhibits, and interactive activities that explore the history of hydro-electric generation and transmission of electricity. Interpretive and education programs at the SHP are provided by the Folsom Powerhouse Docents, a group of volunteers with California State Parks. To date, most of the visitation at the Powerhouse occurs through pre-arranged tours for school groups and others, with some drop-in use on weekends. The Powerhouse visitation is estimated at 2,000-5,000 visitors annually.

## PURPOSE FOR THE PLAN

This document represents a combined State Parks General Plan and Bureau of Reclamation Resource Management Plan (RMP) for the SRA and SHP. The document meets the planning requirements of both agencies, as well as State and Federal environmental analysis requirements under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). This Plan will provide the first RMP direction under Reclamation's land planning and management requirements. The previous General Plan (1979) for Folsom Lake SRA included Auburn Reservoir and approved by the California State Parks and Recreation Commission.

The previous General Plan for Folsom Lake SRA was adopted in 1979 and amended three times, twice in 1988 and again in 1996. Since the adoption of the 1979 General Plan, there have been changes in outdoor recreation trends and activities. Personal watercraft (jet skis) and wake boarding are now both very popular uses on Folsom Lake. Likewise, rowing, kayaking and other paddling sports have become favorite activities on Lake Natoma. Land-based recreational activities have also changed over the years. When the SRA first opened, the trails were used primarily by equestrians and hikers. The rising popularity of running and jogging in the 1970s, and mountain biking in the 1980s and 90s have greatly increased the volume and variety of trail use within the SRA.

The most significant change to occur since 1979 is the 62 percent increase in the population of the Sacramento region, and more specifically the new residential development in the immediate vicinity of the SRA. With urban development surrounding the southern half of the SRA, and roughly 930,000 new residents expected in the region by 2020, which is a 49 percent increase, the new Plan is needed to articulate: the character and level of use envisioned for the SRA; how existing facilities will be used; what future facilities may be needed; and how existing natural and cultural resources may be protected and managed.

Another change which has occurred since the 1979 General Plan is the designation of the Folsom Powerhouse State Historic Park as a separate State Park unit in 1995. This Plan will provide General Plan direction for both Folsom Lake SRA and Folsom Powerhouse SHP. Specific and detailed direction for the management of the Folsom Powerhouse SHP is provided in the Specific Area Goals and Guidelines for the Folsom Powerhouse SHP management zone.

This Plan will serve as the primary management document for both Folsom Lake SRA and Folsom Powerhouse SHP, providing a purpose and vision, long-term goals, and guidelines.

The Plan defines the broad management framework for the development, ongoing management, and public use of the park. This framework will guide the day-to-day decision-making for the park, and serve as the basis for developing focused management plans, specific project plans, and other management actions necessary to implement the goals of the general plan.

## **KEY ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES**

The following are the primary key issues and opportunities addressed by the Plan:

### **Recreation Use and Reservoir Operations**

The operation of Folsom Lake as a reservoir for the purposes of flood control, water supply, power generation, and environmental enhancement results in the significant fluctuation of water levels over the course of a year. Water levels have a direct impact on the access to and quality of water dependent recreation activities at Folsom Lake since water levels determine the availability of boat ramps, beaches, mooring sites, and other facilities that depend largely on water depth or surface area. Water levels also impact the quality of other recreation activities that are enhanced by the proximity to water, such as picnicking, camping, and trail use. On average, the water levels of Folsom Lake fluctuate between 445 feet elevation in early summer (June) and 405 feet in early winter (December), although levels as low as 347 feet have occurred over the last 30 years. The normal operating full pool elevation of the reservoir is 466 feet, which is not achieved every year.

### **Flood Control**

During the flood control season between October and May, a portion of the total capacity of Folsom Lake must be reserved to handle potential flood flows. Since only about 25 percent of annual SRA visits occur during the flood control season, winter flood control operations typically have relatively little impact on recreation use at Folsom Lake.

A number of measures to increase the flood protection of the Sacramento region have been implemented over the past two decades by the primary agencies responsible for flood protection culminating in the Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Project. The key feature of this project is a new gated auxiliary spillway around Folsom Dam. The project may also include a 3.5 foot raise of the dams and dikes. The EIR/EIS for the Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Project was completed in April 2007 and the Record of Decision was issued in May 2007.

Most of the recreation facilities within Folsom Lake SRA are located between the normal high pool elevation of 466 feet and the current top of the Dam elevation of 480.5 feet. During extreme flood events, if the reservoir surcharge space is needed for flood storage, these recreation facilities would be subject to flooding. The new spillway will increase the ability to release water downstream and will reduce the likelihood of these facilities getting inundated in an extreme flood event. The Folsom Dam Safety and Flood Damage Project will not alter the 466 foot elevation normal high pool operating level of the reservoir.

To address the impacts of a potential short term inundation in the instance of an extreme flood event, this General Plan provides for the preparation of a Flood Response Plan for the SRA in cooperation with the Army Corps of Engineers, the Sacramento Area Flood Control Agency (SAFCA) and other appropriate agencies to minimize the risk and potential damage to recreation facilities from inundation and for post-event clean-up. This General Plan directs State Parks and Reclamation to work closely with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and other agencies to minimize and mitigate construction related impacts of flood control projects on recreation facilities and resource areas in a manner consistent with this General Plan/Resource Management Plan.

## Water Supply

From June through September, Folsom Lake is managed and water is released to meet water supply needs, to support water quality in the San Joaquin/Sacramento Delta and to maintain flows and temperatures necessary to support anadromous fish species downstream. Power generation generally conforms to these water supply demands. Seventy five percent of visits to the SRA occur during this period, therefore management of the reservoir levels and water releases during the spring and summer months can have a big impact on recreation uses.

The availability of boat ramps for launching and the desirability of the recreation experience drops significantly when Folsom Lake levels dip below the 420 foot elevation. This General Plan provides direction to increase the efficiency of existing boat launch facilities on Folsom Lake and to increase the boat launch capacity at under-served lake levels, including low water levels. Any increase in boat launch capacity must be carefully considered relative to the surface area on Folsom Lake available for boating at various water levels and the desired boat density.

## **Future of Mississippi Bar**

Mississippi Bar is an undeveloped, one-square-mile river terrace along the western shore of Lake Natoma between Lake Overlook and Negro Bar. While the area includes a rich variety of habitat types, the majority of Mississippi Bar is a highly disturbed landscape. Hydraulic

and dredger mining were used to mine for gold in the Mississippi Bar area of the American River in the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries. A byproduct of these activities is the dredge tailings – piles of cobblestones up to several stories high which are a key feature of the Mississippi Bar landscape. Some of these tailings were subsequently mined for their value as aggregate.

Currently, recreation facilities at Mississippi Bar are limited to a small concession operated stables (Shadow Glen), the Snowberry Creek trailhead and staging area at Sunset/Main Avenues, the paved Lake Natoma bike path, and various dirt equestrian/pedestrian trails that are located in the area. Mississippi Bar represents a significant opportunity for the restoration of riparian wetlands, the development and enhancement of recreation opportunities, and the preservation and interpretation of historic cultural resources. This General Plan addresses the future use of this area through enhanced access and development of additional recreation facilities, while restoring natural resources and providing for historic interpretation.

## **Trails**

The more than 90 miles of trails in the SRA link most of the SRA's facilities. The trail system, which includes both dirt and paved trails, accommodates a variety of users, including walkers and hikers, horseback riders, cyclists, and mountain bikers. Given the increasingly urban setting around the SRA, the demand for trails will continue to grow. However, the narrow land base of the SRA around both lakes is a constraint to the development of additional trails in some areas. Within this context, increased trail use in recent years has raised concerns about conflicts between different trail users, particularly mountain bikers and equestrians.

This General Plan provides direction for the preparation of the Trail Management Plan which will provide detailed guidelines and direction for the management of trails, including reviewing and designating allowed uses on the existing trail system. The General Plan envisions a trail system that provides the broadest possible public benefit; balances the demands of a diverse and constantly growing user population; is flexible enough to respond to changes in recreational demand over time; is part of a larger, integrated regional system with connections to and access from other trail systems; and balances the need to expand with enhancement of the existing facilities.

## **Marina Capacity**

The Folsom Lake Marina at Brown's Ravine is the only marina in the SRA. Existing facilities at the marina include 685 wet slips and 175 dry storage slips. Currently, there is a 5-year

waiting list for a sixteen-foot or twenty-foot slip, and a 9-year wait for a twenty-four-foot slip. Interest in slip rentals has increased significantly in recent years in direct proportion to the growth in nearby residential development.

This General Plan calls for a 30-50 percent expansion in slip capacity at Folsom Lake Marina (between 200 and 340 additional slips) and the necessary upland facilities to support such expansion. It also calls for further detailed study into what, if any, structural improvements are needed to increase slip capacity, such as to the existing breakwater and dock system. Dredging of Brown's Ravine could be used to extend the boating season at Folsom Lake Marina.

### **Traffic Congestion at Major Day Use Areas**

With more than 1.5 million visitors to the SRA each year, and only a handful of major access points, several facilities in the SRA reach capacity by midday on peak season weekends. These facilities include Beal's Point, Granite Bay, and Brown's Ravine. As the day use and boat launch parking lots at these facilities fill and eventually reach capacity—at which point access to the SRA is closed—traffic will backup along entrance roads and onto major access routes and local streets. The result is traffic delays, illegal parking, pedestrian hazards, noise, and access difficulties for SRA neighbors. This General Plan addresses access and circulation improvements at several facilities as a means of reducing delays, improving visitor experience, and minimizing the effects of SRA operations on surrounding neighbors. Improvements proposed include the reconfiguration of entrances at Beal's Point and Granite Bay, the use of temporary electronic message boards in various locations to inform and direct approaching SRA visitors, and the use of radio public service announcements.

### **Camping**

Three campgrounds in the SRA provide a total of 176 campsites that accommodate tent, trailer, RV, and group campers. Peninsula Campground includes 104 family campsites. Beal's Point Campground includes 49 family campsites and 20 RV sites. Negro Bar Campground is comprised of 3 reservation-only group campsites, two campsites accommodate 50 people and the third site accommodates 25 people. Full capacity is reached at all three campgrounds on peak season weekends.

Along with the urban and suburban development and growth around the SRA have come the crime and law enforcement challenges of the urban environment, which have diminished the quality of the camping experience at some locations. Other camping-related issues in the SRA include the need for additional group camping facilities and the continued demand for

camping facilities statewide. Due to the proximity of the SRA to a large metropolitan area and the amount of residential development immediately adjacent to the SRA, this General Plan primarily focuses on providing high quality day use outdoor recreation opportunities. The Plan proposes to convert the three group campsites at Negro Bar into day use facilities and to convert a portion of the family camping at Beal's Point into group campsites. The Plan proposes to increase the number of campsites at the Peninsula Campground by 50 to 100 sites.

## **Wildland-Urban Interface**

The interface between the SRA and adjacent suburban and rural residential development raises several issues. These issues include the visual quality impact of residential development on hillsides and ridgelines visible from within the SRA which alters the perception of the SRA as a rural, natural area. This GP/RMP provides direction work with local jurisdictions in the land use planning and development process to protect key views within the SRA.

Recreation use of the SRA can result in noise impacts to adjacent neighbors. The noise from power boat and personal watercraft engines and music from sound systems on boats traveling on Folsom Lake or moored near shoreline areas can travel great distances and generates some complaints from lakeside neighbors. The analysis in the Preliminary GP/RMP and DEIR/DEIS concluded that existing regulations regarding "peace and quiet in parks" and boat engine noise levels, if adequately enforced, are sufficient to minimize noise impacts. The Preliminary GP/RMP also provides direction that additional site specific environmental analysis will be conducted prior to the development of additional facilities which will address the specific potential noise impacts of those facilities.

Informal access to the SRA from adjacent neighborhoods and private property can become a concern and problem when property owners add gates to the SRA boundary fence line to access the SRA property or completely remove property line fencing and construct spur trails, extend yards or other encroachments into the SRA. The Plan provides direction to develop additional access points as needed and appropriate. The Plan also provides direction to address informal access points from private property with unauthorized improvements, resource damage or use conflicts.

Finally, the proximity of residential development to the natural areas of the SRA raises concern from adjacent property owners and neighborhoods with wildfire risk. The General Plan/Resource Management Plan provides broad direction regarding fire management and includes direction to:

- suppress wildfires;
- collaborate with fire agencies, neighborhood groups fire safe councils and others on projects and programs to promote fire safe practices and reduce wildfire risk in areas adjacent to the SRA;
- provide for the use of prescribed fire and non-fire vegetation management strategies, such as shaded fuel breaks, where appropriate; and
- participate and involve local jurisdictions in land use planning and development process of adjacent lands to help reduce wildfire risk.

### **Off-Road Vehicle Use**

At several locations in the SRA, including at Rattlesnake Bar and Beal's Point on Folsom Lake, visitors drive their vehicles off designated roadways and parking areas to access the receding lakeshore. Off-road vehicle use impacts shoreline vegetation, causes erosion and increased sedimentation and can damage and destroy archaeological resources located below the reservoir high water level which become exposed as the water levels drop. In some locations unauthorized off road vehicle use has led to conflicts and safety issues with legal non-motorized trail users. This General Plan addresses off-road vehicle use in the SRA by restricting vehicles to designated roads and parking areas and by providing formal shoreline access in limited locations as appropriate.

### **Folsom Lake Quiet Day**

Over the course of the planning process for the General Plan, a collection of neighbors, non-motorized boaters and trail users proposed the establishment of a weekly "quiet day" on Folsom Lake whereby the use of motorized boats would be restricted. This concept eventually received the support of a local planning advisory council and a local County Supervisor. This issue involves concerns about motorized boat noise and the compatibility and safety of non-motorized boaters and swimmers on Folsom Lake with motorized boat use. Establishing a weekly "quiet day" on Folsom Lake would displace a great many existing SRA visitors, particularly during the peak season. This General Plan proposes other ways to address the noise and safety concerns on Folsom Lake which would have less impact on existing users, including the extension of the 5 mph zone on the North Fork from Mormon Ravine down to Rattlesnake.

## KEY PROPOSALS AND PLANNING CONCEPTS

The Plan provides both unit-wide direction for a variety of uses and resources and specific direction for 34 separate management zones within the SRA. Four basic land use designations were developed and each of the 34 management zones was assigned one of four designations: Recreation (high or medium intensity), Low Intensity Recreation/Conservation, Preservation or Administration. The land use designations provide a broad framework for the more detailed management area specific guidelines. Of the 19,366 acres within the SRA:

- 11,808 acres are designated High or Medium Intensity Recreation;
- 7,059 acres are designated Low Intensity Recreation/Conservation;
- 146 acres are designated Preservation; and
- 353 acres are designated Administration.

Some of the other key plan concepts and proposals include:

- Maintain and enhance Folsom Lake SRA as an important and popular recreation area that serves a broad range of uses while recognizing that the SRA cannot meet all of the recreation demand in the region and is one segment in the spectrum of recreation opportunities in the region.
- Provide and enhance high quality day use outdoor recreation opportunities. Due to the proximity to the Sacramento metropolitan area and the residential development immediately adjacent to the SRA, the Plan emphasizes day use recreation. Specific proposals in the Plan include: improve aquatic recreation opportunities and facilities (see below); improve and add picnic and group picnic sites and areas; replace the old and worn Granite Bay Activity Center with a new building and develop additional multi-use facilities; develop additional trails and trailhead facilities.
- Provide a modest expansion of camping facilities. Despite the focus on day use opportunities, the Plan does provide for expansion of camping facilities as follows:
  - convert the three group campsites at Negro Bar into day use facilities;

- convert a portion of the family camping at Beal's Point into group campsites; and
- increase the number of campsites at the Peninsula Campground by 50 to 100 sites.
  
- Maintain and improve diverse aquatic recreation opportunities at both Folsom Lake and Lake Natoma including: extend or widen boat ramps at Folsom Lake to improve access at under-served lake levels, expand the existing marina, improve access and launch facilities at Lake Natoma for non-motorized and slow-speed uses.
  
- Coordinate and collaborate with adjacent jurisdictions on public access, trail connections and other issues of common interest. Coordinate with the City of Folsom to provide appropriate pedestrian/trail access and connections from the Historic District and future trail access from the City's Corporation yard property.
  
- Provide a trail system that serves the diverse array of trail users and abilities and is responsive to changes in recreation demand. Plan direction includes: complete recreation trail loops around both Lake Natoma and Folsom Lake; provide connections to other trail systems; prepare a trail management plan which will, among other things, address allowed uses on trails; reduce conflicts on trails through the promotion of trail etiquette and safety.
  
- Improve entrance stations and internal road circulation to increase the efficiency of access into and within the SRA and help reduce impacts to adjacent roadways and neighborhoods.
  
- Develop a visitor center for Folsom Lake SRA to provide information to the public and a location and facility to interpret the themes identified in the Plan. Several potential locations are suggested.
  
- Protect important and sensitive natural resources within the SRA including, vernal pools and seasonal wetlands, riparian areas and blue oak woodlands.
  
- Protect the wildlife habitat and movement corridors that Folsom Lake SRA provides between the Valley and Foothills.
  
- Coordinate Federal and State regulations and responsibilities for the identification, evaluation, protection and management of cultural resources within the SRA.

- Complete investigations necessary to propose a portion of the South Fork Arm of Folsom Lake for Cultural Preserve designation.
- Protect and restore the historic core of the Folsom Powerhouse SHP while improving access, public visitation, education and interpretation opportunities through the operation of the newly constructed Powerhouse visitor center.

## **MANAGEMENT PLANS**

This General Plan/Resource Management Plan recommends the development of a number of more detailed and specific management plans and investigations, including:

- Trail Management Plan
- Fire Management Plan (a draft has been completed)
- Vegetation Management Plan
- Scope of Collections Statement
- Interpretive Plan for Folsom Lake SRA
- Interpretive Plan for Folsom Powerhouse SHP
- Flood Response Plan
- Designation of a Cultural Preserve along a portion of the South Fork Arm of Folsom Lake

## **PLANNING PROCESS AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

In 2002, State Parks in cooperation with Reclamation began working with a team of consultants to update the General Plan/ Resource Management Plan (the Plan) for Folsom Lake State Recreation Area. One of the first tasks in the process was the preparation of the Resource Inventory for the SRA which documented existing conditions within the SRA, including natural resources, cultural resources, recreation use and facilities. This Resource Inventory was eventually completed and made available for public review.

In October 2002, a series of agency stakeholder and focus group meetings—involving recreation and environmental groups, SRA neighbors, responsible agencies, and other interested parties—were held to identify and clarify issues to be addressed in the Plan. A community workshop was held in November 2002 to introduce the project to the general public, review the findings of the draft Resource Inventory and to solicit public input on key issues and opportunities of concern to the public. During this initial round of public input

the issue of trails was identified as a topic that warranted further consultation and analysis. Additional stakeholder meetings were held to further address trails and other specific issues, including the potential for creating an artificial whitewater course in the area of Nimbus Shoals in conjunction with a planned fish diversion structure below Nimbus Dam and the potential of locating the California Indian Heritage Center at Lake Natoma.

Two public surveys were used to expand the quantity and variety of public input. A telephone survey of 400 households in the region was conducted to identify how these households perceive the SRA, whether they use the SRA, and what recreation needs are not currently being met. An on-site visitor intercept survey was also conducted to gather more detailed information about the SRA and its facilities from those who use it. More than 1,300 responses were collected.

Using the information from the Resource Inventory, the initial public scoping input and the survey data, an Issues Opportunities and Constraints Memorandum was prepared to help identify key issues and opportunities to be addressed in the Plan.

Preliminary alternative concepts were then prepared based on the input from the general public, SRA visitors, public agencies, other stakeholders, and State Parks and Reclamation management and staff. These alternatives were presented at a second community workshop in June 2003 and public input was solicited regarding preferences among these initial alternative concepts. Using this public input and the recommendations of State Parks and Reclamation staff, a preferred concept was refined and an administrative draft Preliminary General Plan/Resource Management prepared. Following agency review of the administrative draft, changes and edits were made to the Preliminary Plan and an administrative draft of a Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Impact Statement (DEIR/EIS) was prepared.

The Preliminary Plan and DEIR/DEIS were released to the public on February 8, 2008. In consideration of requests from the public for additional time to review and comment on the document, the public comment period was extended twice through May 30, 2008. A total of 112 days were provided for public review and comment. Three public workshops were held during the comment period to provide information on the key plan concepts and proposals and to receive public comment. These workshops were held in the City of Folsom, Granite Bay and El Dorado Hills. Due to the extent and volume of public comment received, budget and contractual issues it has taken the planning team more than a year to develop this Response to Public Comment and Final EIR/EIS.

In addition to the stakeholder meetings and public workshops, four newsletters were prepared and sent out to a project mailing list of over 700 contacts. Information regarding the plan and various planning documents has been posted on the web pages devoted to the Plan update on State Parks internet site.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS**

The environmental analysis of the proposed plan and alternatives was prepared in compliance with both the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to disclose the potential environmental effects of the proposed plan. The environmental document for the Plan serves as a first tier EIR/EIS. Because the direction in the plan is broad and programmatic, the environmental analysis for the Plan is programmatic in scope and does not include detailed project specific analysis for facilities considered in this Plan. The EIR/EIS discusses probable impacts of implementing the future development and the goals and guidelines proposed in the Plan.

Additional project specific environmental analysis will be conducted as appropriate for facility development, management plans or other improvements proposed in the Plan and the EIR/EIS will serve as a reference for these future environmental documents. When appropriate, the more detailed future project-specific environmental review will be “tiered” to the EIR/EIS prepared for this General Plan/Resource Management Plan.

This Plan includes guidelines that direct future project planning and environmental review to avoid or minimize potential adverse effects to resources during the design, construction and operation of facilities and improvements. Because the direction in the plan contains goals and guidelines designed to protect resources and avoid significant adverse environmental effects, no significant program level impacts were identified which could not be mitigated to a less than significant level.

### **4.2.2 Recommended Changes to Chapter II- Existing Conditions**

#### **A. Unit Summary, 1. Existing Land Use, a. Folsom Lake (p. II-2)**

On the eastern shoreline, Brown’s Ravine and Folsom Point are primary visitor areas. Brown’s Ravine is home to the Folsom Lake Marina which provides 675 wet slips, 175 dry storage spaces, boat launch areas, marine provisions and fueling station, small picnic area, and restrooms. Folsom Point includes a picnic area, boat launch facilities, and restrooms.

Secondary visitor areas on the eastern shore include Skunk Hollow/Salmon Falls whitewater rafting take-out areas, Old Salmon Falls/Monte Vista trailhead and equestrian staging area, and Peninsula Campground with 104 campsites. The El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) raw water pump station and associated facilities, operating under a license agreement with Reclamation, is also located in this portion of the SRA.

A. Unit Summary, 2. Adjacent Land Use, a. Folsom Lake (p. II-8)

The very north end of the SRA abuts the Auburn State Recreation Area on the North Fork of the American River. Auburn SRA includes 26,000 acres of federal lands along 40-miles of the North and Middle Forks of the American River that were set aside for the construction of the Auburn Dam. Primary recreation activities at Auburn SRA include swimming, boating, fishing, camping, hiking, running, equestrian use, mountain biking, gold panning, off-highway motorcycle riding, and whitewater rafting. More than 100 miles of equestrian/hiking trails are located within Auburn SRA, including the Pioneer Express Trail along the North Fork of the American River which connects the Auburn and Folsom Lake SRA's.

A. Unit Summary, 3. Significant Resource Values, c. Cultural Resources (p. II-27)

In 1839, Johann Sutter established a fort on the Sacramento River. Many native Californians came under Sutter's control working either at his New Helvetia settlement or at other ranchos in the region. Sutter's Fort soon became the major stopping point for overland travelers coming down from the Sierra Nevada. Sutter's dominance of the regional economy was short-lived when, in 1848, Sutter's foreman, James W. Marshall, discovered gold in the South Fork of the American River. Within months the American River region was flooded with gold seekers from a myriad cultures and countries. The colorful names given to early mining settlements—Mormon Island, Alabama Bar, Sailor Bar, and Negro Bar among others—give an impression of the range of origins of the area's inhabitants. Stores, saloons, roads, ferries, and bridges were built to supply the miners with various necessities. California Historic Landmark #585, located between Dikes 5 and 6 along Folsom Lake, commemorates the Pioneer Express route used by miners to access mining camps and settlements along the North Fork during the gold rush.

A. Unit Summary, 3. Significant Resource Values, f. Recreation Resources (p. II-38 to II-40)

**Table EC-5: Day Use Facilities**

<i>Beal's Point</i>	<i>Total/Description</i>
Vol. 1, List of Commenters and Master Responses August 2009	Folsom Lake State Recreation Area & Folsom Powerhouse State Historic Park Response to Comments

**Table EC-5: Day Use Facilities**

Beach	Yes
Concession	Snack bar/beach equipment
Restrooms	3
Picnic Tables	53
Barbeques	31
Drinking Water	Yes
Trail Access	Lake Natoma/Granite Bay
Parking	387(including 8 disabled)
<b><i>Granite Bay</i></b>	<b><i>Total/Description</i></b>
Beach	Yes
Concession	Snack bar/beach equipment/boating equipment
Restrooms	5
Picnic Tables	100
Barbeques	42
Activity Center	Group use by reservation
Drinking Water	Yes
Equestrian Staging Area	Yes
Trail Access	Pioneer Express/Granite Bay/Beeks Bight-to Doton's/Beeks Bight ADA
Parking	677793 (includes main beach, Beeks, Activity Center, Equestrian Staging)
<b><i>Old Salmon Falls</i></b>	<b><i>Total/Description</i></b>
Chemical Toilets	2
Drinking Water	No
Equestrian Staging Area	Yes
Trail Access	Brown's Ravine/Sweetwater Creek
Parking <sup>†</sup>	45
<b><i>Rattlesnake Bar</i></b>	<b><i>Total/Description</i></b>
Equestrian Staging Area	Yes
Trail Access	Pioneer Express
Parking	15
<b><i>Peninsula</i></b>	<b><i>Total/Description/Notes</i></b>
Boat Ramp	Yes
Chemical Toilets	2
Picnic Tables	6 with ramadas
Drinking Water	No
Trail Access	No Darrington Trail
Parking <sup>1</sup>	60
<b><i>Darrington Trailhead</i></b>	<b><i>Total/Description</i></b>
Trail Access	Darrington Trail
Parking	25
<b><i>Salmon Falls</i></b>	<b><i>Total/Description</i></b>

Table EC-5: Day Use Facilities

<u>Trail Access</u>	<u>Sweetwater Creek Trail</u>
<u>Parking</u>	<u>15 (for trail access)</u>
<b><i>Old Salmon Falls</i></b>	<b><i>Total/Description</i></b>
<u>Chemical Toilets</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Drinking Water</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Equestrian Staging Area</u>	<u>Yes</u>
<u>Trail Access</u>	<u>Brown's Ravine/Sweetwater Creek</u>
<u>Parking<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>15</u>
<b><i>Brown's Ravine</i></b>	<b><i>Total/Description</i></b>
<u>Equestrian Staging Area</u>	<u>Yes</u>
<u>Trail Access</u>	<u>Brown's Ravine/Old Salmon Falls Trail</u>
<u>Parking</u>	<u>10 (at trailhead/staging area)</u>
<b><i>Mormon Island Cove</i></b>	<b><i>Total/Description</i></b>
<u>Trail Access</u>	<u>Brown's Ravine</u>
<u>Parking</u>	<u>40</u>
<b><i>Folsom Point</i></b>	<b><i>Total/Description</i></b>
Restrooms/Vault Toilets	2/2
Picnic Tables	50
Barbeques	46
Drinking Water	No
<u>Trail Access</u>	<u>Brown's Ravine</u>
<u>Parking</u>	<u>77 (including 2 disabled)</u>
<b><i>Observation Point</i></b>	<b><i>Total/Description – Facilities at Observation Point no longer available for public use due to the Folsom Dam spillway construction</i></b>
Picnic Tables	No
Restrooms/Toilets	No
Drinking Water	No
<u>Trail Access</u>	<u>No</u>
<u>Parking</u>	<u>77 (including 2 disabled)</u>
<b><i>Folsom Sector Office</i></b>	<b><i>Total/Description</i></b>
<u>Trail Access</u>	<u>Lake Natoma/Beal's Point Trail</u>
<u>Parking</u>	<u>15</u>
<b><i>Folsom Powerhouse</i></b>	<b><i>Total/Description</i></b>
Main Powerhouse	Museum
Concessions	Gift shop
Restrooms	1
Picnic Tables	10
Drinking Water	Yes
<u>Trail Access</u>	<u>Powerhouse Loop</u>
<u>Parking<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>35</u>

**Table EC-5: Day Use Facilities**

<b><i>Willow Creek</i></b>	<i>Total/Description</i>
Concessions	Boating equipment
Boat Ramp	Yes
Vault Toilets	2
Picnic Tables	4
Barbeques	No
Drinking Water	No
Trail Access	Lake Natoma
Parking <sup>1</sup>	20 (including 1 disabled)
<b><i>Parkshore Access</i></b>	<i>Total/Description</i>
<u>Trail Access</u>	<u>Lake Natoma</u>
<u>Parking</u>	<u>18</u>
<b><i>Nimbus Flat</i></b>	<i>Total/Description</i>
Beach	Yes
Restrooms	2
Picnic Tables	37
Barbeques	11
Boat Ramp	2 small docks
Drinking Water	Yes
Trail Access	Lake Natoma
Parking	231 (including 8 disabled)
<b><i>Lake Overlook</i></b>	<i>Total/Description</i>
Restrooms/Toilets	No
Picnic Tables	No
Drinking Water	No
Equestrian Staging Area	Yes
Trail Access	Lake Natoma
Parking <sup>1</sup>	150
<b><i>Mississippi Bar/Snowberry Trailhead(Main Avenue)</i></b>	<i>Total/Description</i>
<u>Equestrian Staging Area</u>	<u>Yes</u>
<u>Trail Access</u>	<u>Lake Natoma/various trails</u>
<u>Parking</u>	<u>40</u>
<b><i>Negro Bar</i></b>	<i>Total/Description</i>
Beach	Yes
Concessions	Boating equipment
Restrooms	2
Picnic Tables	32
Barbeques	4

**Table EC-5: Day Use Facilities**

Boat Ramp	Yes
Drinking Water	Yes
<u>Equestrian Staging Area</u>	<u>Yes</u>
Trail Access	Lake Natoma
Parking	96 (including 4 disabled)

<sup>1</sup> Estimated capacity as vehicle spaces are not striped.

Source: State Parks; Wallace Roberts & Todd, 2005.

## 4.2.3 Recommended Changes to Chapter III- The Plan

### B. Classification and Management Zones, 2. Management Zones (p. III-9)

- Low Intensity Recreation/Conservation.** Areas whose natural and cultural resource values will be protected and restored while accommodating lower intensity recreation and interpretation that is compatible with and dependent on the resource values. Recreation use and facilities occur in these areas, however the level of use is generally lower intensity than Recreation areas. While some developed facilities are located in these areas, there tend to be fewer and less developed facilities than in Recreation areas and direct vehicle access may not always exist. Recreation use and facilities, while present, do not dominate these areas. These areas offer opportunities for more ~~challenging and adventure-based~~ recreational activities in a ~~more~~ natural setting. ~~Facilities in these areas (if provided) tend to be more primitive than in Recreation areas and direct vehicle access may not always exist.~~ Resource management in Low Intensity Recreation/Conservation areas emphasizes protecting and restoring natural processes with only minor modification of non-sensitive resources permitted to accommodate additional visitor use as appropriate. ~~Conservation areas in the SRA generally represent the shorelines between recreation areas on Folsom Lake and Lake Natoma, as well as the North and South Forks of the American River.~~

### B. Classification and Management Zones, 3. Land Use Summary (pp. III-10 and III-12)

The General Plan is intended to guide future use and enhancement of the Folsom Lake State Recreation Area over the coming decades. The General Plan strives to provide a balance of uses that protects the SRA's natural and cultural resources, while enhancing the public's ability to enjoy and understand them. The total area of the State Recreation Area is

approximately 19,360 acres, of which roughly 11,320 acres are water and 8,040 acres are uplands. As described above, the General Plan divides this total acreage into four land use categories: recreation areas, low intensity recreation/conservation areas, preservation areas, and ...

Low Intensity Recreation/Conservation areas in the SRA include some 7,190 acres, or about 37 percent of the total area. Of this area, 6,200 acres are in uplands and 990 acres are water. Upland conservation areas on both Folsom Lake and Lake Natoma include shoreline areas between the day use areas designated Recreation. In ~~most some areas cases~~, trails and related facilities are the only improvements in these areas. In other areas such as the Peninsula, there are developed facilities such as the campground, boat ramps and day use area which are surrounded by a large undeveloped natural area which is home to the largest family camping facility in the SRA. The North and South Forks of the American River and the upper portion of Lake Natoma are also designated Low Intensity Recreation /Conservation.

C. Unit-wide Management Goals and Guidelines, 1. Resource Management and Protection, (p. III-43)

*6.) Watershed and Water Quality Management*

WATER-3: Work with adjacent property owners, adjacent jurisdictions, user and interest groups, schools, local water purveyors and others to provide education regarding the protection of water quality.

C. Unit-wide Management Goals and Guidelines, 3. Unit-wide Visitor Services, (p. III-71)

VISIT-12: Expand the area governed by the 5 mph speed limit to the North Fork Arm of Folsom Lake in order to preserve the setting, enhance the quiet and sheltered character of the water, and reduce conflicts between motorized and non-motorized watercraft. ~~Consider expansion of speed limit zone on South Fork Arm as appropriate.~~

VISIT-13: Manage Lake Natoma for slow speed and non-motorized water recreation. Continue the 5 mph speed limit for motorized watercraft for the entire Lake. Prohibit the use of personal water craft at Lake Natoma. Phase out the use of two-stroke engines at Lake Natoma. Utilize California Air Resources Board emissions standards in developing standards and regulations to phase out high emission two-stroke engines. Phase out the use of gasoline engines on Lake

Natoma to preserve the setting and character of the lake, enhance the visitor experience, and solidify the role of the lake as a premier paddling/rowing destination. Exceptions ~~would~~ may be made for emergency response vessels and vessels necessary for other administrative purposes.

C. Unit-wide Management Goals and Guidelines, 3. Unit-wide Visitor Services, b. Upland Recreation (p. III-78, 82-85, and 87)

*1.) Camping*

VISIT-34: Explore the potential to develop a small equestrian camping facility (approximately 5-10 campsites). Potential locations for an equestrian camping facility include: Mississippi Bar, Peninsula or Rattlesnake Bar.

VISIT-35: Explore the potential to develop a small camping facility (approximately 5-10 campsites) which serves the needs of bicyclists. Potential locations include: the El Dorado Shore, Peninsula or Rattlesnake Bar.

*2.) Trails*

***Trail Classification and Designation***

VISIT-41: Within Folsom Lake SRA there are generally the following types of trails: paved bicycle trails (some with shoulders of native materials), dirt trails designated for multiple or shared-use (equestrians, bikes and pedestrians), dirt trails designated for limited use (pedestrian/equestrian or bicycle/equestrian and fully accessible or interpretive trails. The guidelines below provide broad direction regarding the typical or desirable location and characteristics of each type of trail. Establish a trail classification scheme for application to the trail system under the Trail Master Plan. The classification scheme is intended to inform the design, allowable uses, and management of trails in the system. Trail classifications include:

~~Shared Use Paved Trail – Class 1 Bike Path;~~

~~Shared Use Dirt Trail;~~

~~Shared Use Dirt Trail – Alternating Day/Time Separation Option;~~

~~Limited Use Trail; and~~

~~Fully Accessible Trail.~~

VISIT-412: ~~Shared Use Paved Trail—Class 4 Paved Trail Bike Path.~~ This paved trail generally meets Caltrans Class 1 separated bicycle trail path criteria and has decomposed granite shoulders or an adjacent parallel dirt path that serves multiple users. However, not all portions of the paved bike paths within Folsom Lake SRA meet the Caltrans Class 1 trail designation. This trail serves road bicyclists as well as other trail users and hence speeds along the paved section of trail are significantly faster than other trails. Because of the potential for the faster speeds, allowing equestrian use on the shoulder immediately adjacent to the paved trail is a less than ideal situation. If the trail is intended to serve equestrians, managers should consider providing one dirt shoulder at least 4 feet wide or a parallel shared use dirt trail. Typical or desirable characteristics of this trail classification include: (remainder of this guideline remains the same)

VISIT-423: ~~Shared Use or Multi-Use Dirt Trail.~~ This unpaved trail is designed, developed, and managed for all types of users (e.g., pedestrians, bicycles, and equestrians). Multiple uses are accommodated on a single trail designed, located, and managed to accommodate these uses. Typical or desirable characteristics of this trail classification include: (remainder of this guideline remains the same)

VISIT-44: ~~Shared Use Dirt Trail—Alternating Day/Time Separation Option. An unpaved trail designed or developed for limited use, but managed to provide opportunity for all types of users (e.g., pedestrians, bicycles, and equestrians). Multiple uses are accommodated on a single trail by separating the times during which various uses are allowed. Typical or desirable characteristics of this trail classification include:~~

- ~~— Location: Because these trails serve a more limited range of users at any one time they are generally not located closest to population centers.~~
- ~~— Access/Connectivity: To prevent confusion with trails having other designations, these trails should have a limited number of connections to other system trails.~~
- ~~— Terrain: This type of trail is generally more suitable for less severe terrain with more gradual grades, gentler cross-slopes and good sight lines. The terrain is conducive to providing opportunities for different types of users to safely pass one another.~~

~~— Degree of Difficulty: This type of trail designation is suitable for trails that provide a moderate to challenging experience. Time separation is one technique to safely provide a challenging experience for different types of users on a single system trail.~~

~~— Use Character: Moderate volumes of trail users.~~

VISIT-435: *Limited Use Trails*. These trails are designed, developed, and managed for one or more, but not all types of users (e.g., pedestrian/mountain biking, pedestrian/equestrian, or pedestrian only). Use is limited due to factors such as the presence of sensitive resources (e.g. boardwalks around vernal pools), unique suitability for a particular use, or desire for particular visitor experience. Use is typically accommodated on a single trail, though several types of limited use trails may share a broad trail corridor to provide access for all types of trail users in a single area. In this situation, providing parallel limited use trails, sufficient suitable terrain is required to locate the individual trails and to provide sufficient separation for a quality user experience. It should be noted that parallel limited use trails not only require more land, but also may have greater impacts on natural and cultural resources and require maintenance of more trail mileage than shared use dirt trails. There is no assurance that establishing parallel limited use trails would be effective in eliminating conflicts as unauthorized use of the trails would still be a challenge to enforce. Typical or desirable characteristics of this trail classification include:

- Location: Because these trails serve a limited range of users they generally are not located closest to population centers.
- Access/Connectivity: These trails are restricted to specific trail uses. To prevent inadvertent use by restricted uses these trails should have a limited number of connections to other system trails. If parallel limited use trails are provided, connections between the parallel trails should be limited and carefully considered to prevent conflicts.
- Terrain: Because of the various purposes for limited use trails, the type terrain suitable for these trails may be highly variable, from gentle terrain for hiking only trails with sensitive resources or steep and severe terrain for challenging trail experiences for a particular use. The terrain may not be

conducive to providing opportunities for different types of users to safely pass one another.

- Degree of Difficulty: The difficulty of the trail may be highly variable depending upon the purpose of the particular limited use trail.
- Use Character: These trails serve a limited range of users and volumes of trail users are likely to be low to moderate. However, if the trail provides a unique experience with few similar opportunities in the region, use volumes may be high at times. Trail speeds are variable.

VISIT-446: Fully Accessible or Interpretive Trail. This trail is designed to be fully accessible to disabled users, including wheelchairs. Allowable uses on these trails are generally restricted to pedestrians, wheelchairs and other mobility assistance devices. Typical or desirable characteristics of this trail classification include: (the remainder of this guidelines remains the same)

VISIT-45: The development of a Trails Management Plan will include an inventory and classification of trails for the purposes of trail maintenance standards and priorities. These trail classifications are based on a variety of criteria including: types of uses, proximity to other facilities, access and connection, and user patterns.

VISIT-46: The trails within the SRA all have existing designated allowed uses. These designations of allowed use have occurred over time in various ways including adopting the existing/historical use and new trails developed for specific purposes. As part of the development of the Trails Management Plan, the existing allowed uses on the Folsom Lake SRA trails will be assessed and any proposed changes to the allowed uses will be analyzed in the Trail Management Plan and future trail planning. In making decisions regarding changes to allowed uses on specific trails, many factors will be considered, including: trail condition, trail use, terrain, safety, access and connectivity, location, trail sustainability, recreation demand, impacts to natural and cultural resources and other factors.

VISIT-47: There are many strategies that could be employed to provide equitable access to all trail users including developing or designating multi-use trails, designating alternating days of use for different trail users on a particular trail, developing additional limited use trails and other potential tools and strategies. Decisions on

which particular strategy to utilize will be made on a case by case basis considering site specific conditions in the Trail Management Plan and future trail planning.

### ***Trail Access and Connectivity***

VISIT-487: Provide sufficient access to the SRA trail system to adequately serve the public and to discourage the creation of unauthorized and individual access points by adjacent neighbors. Establish new access points as appropriate and feasible, including by formalizing and improving existing informal access points.

### ***Private Property Owners***

VISIT-65: Eliminate existing unauthorized access improvements points and connections to the trail system from adjacent private property. Prioritize addressing unauthorized access points and improvements where resource damage or use conflicts are occurring. Monitor the SRA's urban boundaries to prevent the establishment of new unauthorized access to the trail system.

### C. Unit-wide Management Goals and Guidelines, 3. Unit-wide Visitor Services, e. Circulation and Public Access (p. III-90)

CIRCULATE-8: Eliminate unauthorized access improvements informal and illegal access to the SRA from adjacent private property. Prioritize addressing unauthorized access points and improvements where resource damage or use conflicts are occurring

### C. Unit-wide Management Goals and Guidelines, 5. Visitor Capacity, b. Visitor Capacity and this General Plan/Resource Management Plan (p. III-118)

#### *2.) Boating Capacity and Lake Levels*

State Parks believes that boating densities at the high end of the range, such as 1 boat/5 water surface acres, would result in congestion on Folsom Lake and is not a desirable capacity considering the mixture of uses on the water (sailing, water skiing, fishing), the generally shallow topography and hazards that result as water levels drop, and the fact that there is no required directional boating patterns or significant separation of uses. A capacity of 1 boat/10-20 water surface acres would seem to be a reasonable capacity level for the main body of Folsom Lake and is within the desired range projected by the 1979 General Plan. On the upper North and South Fork Arms of Folsom Lake, lower boating densities

would be more appropriate—closer to 1 boat/~~5-20-30~~ water surface acres—in order to retain the more remote and natural character of these areas. This represents a management challenge since motor boaters often gather to socialize in the 5 mph zone on the North Fork, and whitewater rafters congregate in the area of Salmon Falls on the South Fork in late afternoon before taking-out after a trip down river. Table P-4 shows the range of boating capacities at various water levels on Folsom Lake.

D. Specific Area Goals and Guidelines, 4. Mississippi Bar (pp. III-130, 135 and 136)

Statement of Management Intent

The limited recreation facilities that do exist at Mississippi Bar include an equestrian stable and riding concession (Shadow Glen Stables), ~~(an equestrian concessionaire)~~, the Sunset/Main avenues trailhead and staging area (Snowberry Creek Assembly Area), the Lake Natoma bike path, the Lake Natoma equestrian/pedestrian trail, and the Middle Ridge and Snowberry equestrian/pedestrian trails. The area is also criss-crossed by a number of informal equestrian riding trails from users of the stable concession ~~Shadow Glen~~.

MISSISSIPPI-25: ~~Emphasize enhanced trail access and public recreation at the Shadow Glen equestrian facility and not the private boarding of horses. Work with the concessionaire to improve the Shadow Glen equestrian stable and riding facility as necessary in order to reduce the impact of operations here on area resources, to improve the services provided to the public and enhance the visual quality of the facility. Ensure that the facility manure management program prevents water quality impacts from run-off. Implement standards, requirements, and restrictions on animal feed and manure management as necessary to prevent the introduction and spread of invasive exotic weeds within the SRA.~~

MISSISSIPPI-26: ~~Eventually phase out the stables at Mississippi Bar. This may occur if the current concessionaire decides to vacate the concession, or when the concession contract expires. The area of the stables may be used for access, parking, trailhead/staging facilities, or other day use facilities consistent with the other direction provided for the area. Provide the opportunity for a concession operation at Mississippi Bar for the purpose of horse rentals, trail rides and horse boarding. If the concessionaire decides to vacate the concession and a replacement is not found, this area may be used for improved access, parking, trailhead and staging or other day use facilities consistent with the other direction provided for the area.~~

MISSISSIPPI-27: Evaluate and consider improvements to the stable facilities as part of developing a long term concession contract for the concession operation. These improved facilities may include a limited number of equestrian camping sites at Mississippi Bar.

~~MISSISSIPPI-28 7: Upgrade the Snipes-Pershing pedestrian/equestrian trail as necessary to improve user safety. The nature of the improvements and affected trail segments will be determined by the Trail Master Plan proposed in Guideline VISIT-34.~~

MISSISSIPPI-29 8: Explore improvements to existing trails, trailhead and staging area facilities and the development of new trail facilities in the area. Improvements to existing facilities may include: hitching rails, water troughs, restrooms and potable water.

### **Access**

MISSISSIPPI-30 29: Provide limited vehicle access and small parking area(s) within Mississippi Bar. Limit the impact of vehicle access and parking to previously disturbed portions of the area if feasible.

### D. Specific Area Goals and Guidelines, 5. Negro Bar (pp. III-137-138) **Recreation**

NEGROBAR-1: Relocate the group campground to another location within the SRA, as appropriate, and convert the vacated area for group picnic use. Beal's Point is the proposed location to re-locate the group camping. Reuse of the remaining recreation amenities associated with the relocated campground, such as flush toilets, picnic tables, and barbeques, should be maximized as appropriate. Site-specific planning will be used to determine the precise location and configuration of the new group picnic area. Refer to the camping policies of this Chapter (VISIT-28 through VISIT-32) for further information.

NEGROBAR-2: Provide a low dock at the existing boat ramp for hand launching of paddling/rowing watercraft. Consider other improvements to this boat launching are including restrooms, the potential for boat storage and improved parking closer to the Lake. Such a facility will provide safe and convenient water access for paddlers and rowers to this end of Lake Natoma.

***Interpretation and Education***

NEGROBAR-3: Provide improvements to the equestrian staging area. Potential improvements include hitching rails, water troughs, potable water, picnic tables and other improvements.

**RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

NEGROBAR-6: Reduce and reconfigure the underutilized paved parking area above the boat ramp and adjacent to the group campground. Consider redesign and use of a portion of the area for new day use and/or interpretive facilities. Areas not to be used for new day use facilities will be restored ~~Restore the area~~ to more natural conditions using locally native and appropriate plant species.

NEGROBAR-7: Redesign ~~Restore~~ the upland area along the shoreline at Rainbow Rocks which currently contains a small paved parking area no longer used for vehicle parking. Improve pedestrian pathways along the shoreline and connection with the Historic Truss Bridge. Provide access to the Lake for trail users as appropriate. Areas not used for new day use facilities should be restored to ~~more~~ natural conditions using locally native and appropriate plant species. ~~Safe and convenient water access for pedestrians should also be provided here where appropriate.~~ Naturalization of the shoreline here will ~~not only~~ enhance the unique character of this scenic location and, but also the visitor experience.

**RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**

D. Specific Area Goals and Guidelines, 6. Natoma Canyon (p. III-140)

**Statement of Management Intent**

The Natoma Canyon management zone links Folsom Lake and Lake Natoma and extends from Folsom Dam downstream along the American River Canyon to the Rainbow Bridge in Folsom. While the eastern boundary of the zone abuts the Folsom State Prison lands and includes little more than the steep walls of the canyon, the western boundary extends to include a broader upland area. The Lake Natoma Bike Path, a paved trail that connects the lakes, and parallel dirt trails are ~~is~~ the only ~~existing~~ recreation facilities ~~in~~ the zone. An old olive grove exists in the broad upland area and remnants of the original Folsom Dam are visible in the gorge. The old Powerhouse Canal also remains and extends from the original dam site downstream to the Folsom Powerhouse.

D. Specific Area Goals and Guidelines, 8. Natoma Shore North (p. III-147-149)**Statement of Management Intent**

The Natoma Shore North management zone stretches along the eastern shore of Lake Natoma from the Powerhouse south to Willow Creek. The Lake Natoma paved bike path and dirt multi-use trail, and the trailhead accessing them at Parkshore, are the only existing facilities in the zone. The shoreline areas of the zone include heavy riparian vegetation while the upland areas consist largely of interior live oak woodland. The management intent for this zone is to maintain its role as a natural and scenic link for trail users between the northern and southern ends of Lake Natoma.

**Guidelines*****Access***

NATSHORE/N-1: Work with the Sacramento Regional Transit District (RT) and the City of Folsom to coordinate pedestrian and bicycle links between the SRA and ~~future the LRT light rail stations to be located along Folsom Boulevard south of Glenn Drive.~~

***Resource Management***

NATSHORE/N-2: Improve trail connection and access with the City of Folsom trails and pedestrian access from the City of Folsom Historic District. Provide a connection for the paved bike trail from where the paved trail currently ends at the Folsom Boulevard Bridge and the Folsom Powerhouse parking lot.

NATSHORE/N-3: Improve access to Lake Natoma from the City of Folsom Historic District where appropriate and feasible. Evaluate the feasibility and suitability of providing a small dock for hand launching and landing of small boats at this location. Consider concession opportunities as one potential means to provide access to the water at this location.

NATSHORE/N-4: When there is a change in land use of the City-owned Corporation yard property adjacent to the SRA, coordinate with the City of Folsom, interested members of the community and others in planning and creating appropriate public access and trail connections for pedestrian use from the Corporation yard property to the SRA.

D. Specific Area Goals and Guidelines, 9. Natoma Shore South (pp. III-150, 151 and 154)**Statement of Management Intent**

Also located along the eastern shore of Lake Natoma, the Natoma Shore South management zone lies between the Natoma Shore North and Nimbus Flat zones. ~~As with Natoma Shore North,~~ This management zone ~~contains primarily important natural resources, including dominated by~~ blue oak woodland and grassland. A small area of riparian habitat is concentrated around Willow Creek. Recreation facilities in this management zone are minimal and include the Willow Creek day use area (small picnic area, toilets, and informal boat ramp) and Lake Natoma paved bike path and dirt multi-use trail. Consistent with the previous General Plan for the SRA, this Plan provides for the potential use of the 28-acre Museum Flat area as a site for the California Indian Heritage Center (CIHC). The management intent for this zone is to maintain its role as a natural and scenic link for trail users between the northern and southern ends of Lake Natoma, enhancing the recreation resources of the area, and providing the potential for an interpretive facility of statewide importance.

**Natoma Shore South Management Zone: Land Use Summary**

Land Use Designation	Upland Area	Aquatic Area	Total Area
<del>Conservation Recreation-</del> <u>Medium</u>	127	0	127

Source: State Parks; Wallace Roberts & Todd, 2005.

***Interpretation and Education***

NATSHORE/S-2: If the CHIC is not developed at this location, this site may be considered as a potential location for a small visitor center for the SRA, a site for interpretive programs or facilities, or a small multi-use facility. Such a facility may include a limited number of picnic sites and/or house appropriate types of concession activities such as bicycle rentals. Any future use would be sized and located to avoid or minimize impacts to the blue oak woodlands, seasonal wetlands and cultural resources in the area. The viewshed of Lake Natoma will be protected by limiting building heights and size and locating structures away from bluffs. Any new use or facility would need to be designed and located to avoid conflicts with the paved trail which passes through the area.

***Recreation***

- NATSHORE/S-18: Upgrade and enhance the Willow Creek day use area to improve the overall function and appearance of the facility. Site-specific planning will be used to determine the precise nature and configuration of the upgrades. Upgrades could include:
- Picnic area improvements utilizing native vegetation (no turf);
  - Parking area improvements (~~minimize additional paving~~); and
  - Improved small boat water access, including small ramp and boat dock launching of small boats.

D. Specific Area Goals and Guidelines, 11. Lower Lake Natoma (p. III-158)

**Guidelines**

***Resource Management***

- NATOMA/LOW-1: Manage Lake Natoma for slow speed and non-motorized water recreation. Continue the 5 mph speed limit for motorized watercraft for the entire Lake. Prohibit the use of personal water craft at Lake Natoma. Phase out the use of two-stroke engines at Lake Natoma. Utilize California Air Resources Board emissions standards for in developing phase out of high emission two-stroke engines. Limit public use of motorized watercraft on Lake Natoma to electric trolling motors only to reduce noise and water pollution, and continue the 5 mph speed limit for motorized watercraft for the entire Lake. Develop a program to phase out the use of gas engines.
- NATOMA/LOW-2: Allow for exceptions to the limit on two-stroke engines ~~motorized use~~—until cleaner alternatives can be implemented—~~for the following:~~
- ~~— California State University Sacramento (CSUS) Aquatic Center instruction and coaching boats;~~
  - ~~— State Parks patrol boats and other emergency response vessels; and~~

- ~~Other as necessary for administrative purposes, on a case by case basis.~~

D. Specific Area Goals and Guidelines, 12. Upper Lake Natoma (p. III-160)

**Guidelines**

***Resource Management***

NATOMA/UP-1: ~~Manage Lake Natoma for slow speed and non-motorized water recreation. Continue the 5 mph speed limit for motorized watercraft for the entire Lake. Prohibit the use of personal water craft at Lake Natoma. Phase out the use of two-stroke engines at Lake Natoma. Utilize California Air Resources Board emissions standards for in developing phase out of high emission two-stroke engines. Develop a program to phase out the use of gas engines on all of Lake Natoma in an effort to reduce noise and water pollution.~~

~~NATOMA/UP-2: Limit public use of motorized watercraft on Lake Natoma to electric trolling motors only to reduce noise and water pollution, and continue the 5 mph speed limit for motorized watercraft for the entire lake.~~

NATOMA/UP-3: Allow for exceptions to the limit on two-stroke engines ~~motorized use~~—until cleaner alternatives can be implemented—~~for the following:~~

- ~~— California State University Sacramento (CSUS) Aquatic Center instruction and coaching boats;~~
- ~~— State Parks patrol boats and other emergency response vessels; and~~
- ~~— Other as necessary for administrative purposes, on a case by case basis.~~

D. Specific Area Goals and Guidelines, 15. Mooney Ridge (p. III-166)

Statement of Management Intent

This management zone ~~includes~~ is a narrow band along the western shore of Folsom Lake from Beal's Point to Granite Bay. A dirt service road from Granite Bay to Dike 4 serves as a multi-use trail through this management zone and this route is shared by t~~The Pioneer Express trail. The trail pedestrian and equestrian trail, which extends the length of the area, is the only facility in the zone.~~

D. Specific Area Goals and Guidelines, 16. Granite Bay North (pp. III-167-169)

## Statement of Management Intent

The Pioneer Express pedestrian/equestrian trail passes through the zone and a scenic pedestrian-only ADA trail extends from a trailhead and parking area near the equestrian staging area at Beeks Bight to the end of Doton's Point.

**Guidelines****Recreation**

GRANBAY/NO-3: Make improvements and upgrades to the existing equestrian staging area which is old and worn. Potential improvements include: improved parking area, new hitching rails, water troughs, new picnic sites and tables.

D. Specific Area Goals and Guidelines, 19. Rattlesnake Bar (p. III-177)**Guidelines****Recreation**

RATBAR-3: Make improvements to existing equestrian staging area and trailhead facilities. Improvements may include hitching rails, water troughs, restroom and picnic sites and tables.

D. Specific Area Goals and Guidelines, 22. Peninsula (pp. III-184-185)**Guidelines****Recreation**

PENINSULA-4: Develop ~~Provide a small~~ trailhead facilities, including parking and trail information sign. ~~As trail use in the area grows and new trails developed,~~ include additional trailhead and equestrian staging facilities as needed including, restrooms, hitching rails, water troughs and picnic tables. ~~at the Peninsula Campground.~~ This trailhead would mark the beginning of the proposed trail corridor from the Peninsula area north along the North Fork of the American River and could also serve as a more formal access to the Darrington Trail and other trails in the area. Refer to guidelines NORTHFORK-1 through 3 for further information.

D. Specific Area Goals and Guidelines, 25. El Dorado Shore (pp. III-192-194 and 196)**Statement of Management Intent**

...The Sweetwater Creek trail extends 2 miles further north to Salmon Falls. The zone also contains the remnants of an old private campground (Monte Vista) that has long been abandoned and overgrown. The El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) raw water pump station and associated facilities, operating under a license agreement with Reclamation, is also located in this management zone. The management intent for this zone is to maintain the natural and scenic character of the area and protecting the important cultural resources while enhancing trail use and access.

**Guidelines*****Recreation***

ELDOSHORE-4: Consider development of small picnic facility in this area, either in association with the improvements to the Falcon Crest trailhead and staging area, at the Old Salmon Falls location or in the vicinity of the former Monte Vista campground site.

***Operations***

ELDOSHORE-19: Work cooperatively with the El Dorado Irrigation District to accommodate the needs of their water supply facility, as appropriate, while protecting the resources and public uses and facilities of the SRA.

D. Specific Area Goals and Guidelines, 27. Mormon Island Cove (p. III-202)**Guidelines*****Recreation***

MORMONCOVE-1: Make improvements to the trailhead as use and demand increase, including restrooms, paved parking and picnic tables. ~~As feasible and appropriate, As feasible,~~ relocate the existing trailhead facility at Mormon Island Dam closer to Green Valley Road and intersection with Sophia Parkway to increase visibility, reduce the risk of vandalism, and ease patrol of the area.

MORMONCOVE-2: Develop a Class I bike path from the trailhead at Mormon Island Dam to Dike 7. This path would utilize the existing Folsom Point/Brown's Ravine multi-use trail/service road across Mormon Island Dam to Folsom Point and extend across Dike 8 to a proposed trailhead at Dike 7. If completed in conjunction with other new trail corridors proposed in the General Plan, then cyclists could eventually ride on paved bike lanes and paths from El Dorado Hills to Discovery Park in Downtown Sacramento along the American River Bike Trail. Consider extending this paved bike path from Mormon Island Cove to Browns Ravine. Refer to guidelines NATOMACAN-1, NATOMACAN-2, POWERHOUSE-4 and POWERHOUSE-5 for further information.

D. Specific Area Goals and Guidelines, 29. Folsom Point (pp. III-207-209)

**Folsom Point Management Zone: Land Use Summary**

Land Use Designation	Upland Area	Aquatic Area	Total Area
Recreation – <u>High</u> <del>Medium</del>	293	0	139

Source: State Parks; Wallace Roberts & Todd, 2005.

**Guidelines**

***Recreation***

FOLSOMPOINT-1: Upgrade and enhance the Folsom Point day use area to improve the overall function and appearance of the facility. Site-specific planning will be used to determine the precise nature and configuration of the upgrades. Upgrades could include:

- Picnic area improvements, including development of group picnic areas, utilizing native vegetation (no turf);
- Flush toilets and drinking water; and
- Parking area improvements (restrict vehicles to paved surfaces).

- Explore the feasibility to develop a beach area along the eastern side of Folsom Point, between the Point and Mormon Island Dam

FOLSOMPOINT-9: Depending upon the final configuration of the Dike 7 area following the construction of the new auxiliary spillway, consider this area as a potential location for a new visitor center or multi-use facility.

## 4.3 RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE EIR/EIS

### 4.3.1 Recommended Changes to Section 4.1- Introduction

#### 4.1.2 Purpose and Need

(starting at the seventh paragraph in this section)

~~... Both CEQA and NEPA encourage agencies to use a tiering process for environmental review of subsequent projects pursuant to or consistent with a general plan. The tiering concept is designed to promote efficiency by eliminating repetitive discussions of general matters contained in a broader EIS/EIR and concentrating solely on issues specific to the later project. Where an EIS/EIR has been prepared and approved for a plan, a lead agency may limit environmental review of the later project to effects which were not examined as significant effects in the prior EIS/EIR or can be substantially reduced or avoided by revisions in the project. The later environmental document is “tiered” or procedurally connected to the large scale plan EIS/EIR. These assessments may later incorporate by reference the general discussion from the program level EIS/EIR and concentrate solely on issues specific to later projects. Accordingly this Plan constitutes the first and most general tier of environmental review.~~

The Draft General Plan/Resource Management Plan (Plan) and EIS/EIR are combined herein as one document. Chapter 2, Existing Conditions, serves as the environmental setting for the environmental analysis. Chapter 3 is a detailed description of the Draft Plan, which is

the Preferred Alternative. This Draft Plan is summarized in Chapter 4 as Alternative 2, the Preferred Alternative, along with the other alternatives considered. Chapter 3 contains complete policy goals and guidelines, management zone descriptions and designations, and serves as the project description. Combining preparation of the Draft Plan with the environmental analysis provides the opportunity to mitigate impacts of the Plan through the goals and guidelines. For impacts that are identified in this section, some of the goals and guidelines from Chapter 3 serve as mitigation as well as those mitigation measures that are noted in this chapter.

Implementation of project-specific development plans will be carried out as funding allows. Each subsequent specific development plan or project will be subject to further, more detailed environmental review to determine if it is consistent with this Plan and whether this programmatic EIS/EIR adequately addresses impacts of the proposed project. More detailed environmental review to identify significant environmental impacts and mitigation measures specific to the project would be required once details of the project are known rather than at the Plan level.

### 4.1.3 Tiered Environmental Review Process

Both CEQA and NEPA encourage agencies to use a tiered process for environmental review of subsequent projects pursuant to or consistent with a general plan. The tiered concept is designed to promote efficiency by eliminating repetitive discussions of general matters contained in a broader EIS/EIR and concentrating solely on issues specific to the later project. Where an EIS/EIR has been prepared and approved for a plan, a lead agency may limit environmental review of the later project to effects which were not examined as significant effects in the prior EIS/EIR or can be substantially reduced or avoided by revisions in the project. The later environmental document is “tiered” or procedurally connected to the large-scale plan EIS/EIR. These assessments may later incorporate by reference the general discussion from the program-level EIS/EIR and concentrate solely on issues specific to later projects. Accordingly this Plan constitutes the first and most general tier of environmental review and is considered the “Master EIS/EIR.”

Proposed actions contained in the Plan would be subject to additional environmental review if they: 1) trigger CEQA and/or NEPA; 2) are not exempt from the requirements of either CEQA or NEPA; and 3) are outside of the scope of the Master EIS/EIR, or would cause an additional significant environmental effect or require additional mitigation. At this time, it is not possible to determine whether or not specific proposed activities would require additional environmental review without an individual assessment for each proposed action.

However, examples of proposed actions that would likely require project-level environmental review include: expansion of marina capacity at Brown’s Ravine, construction of large new buildings or similar substantial site improvements and other activities that do not fall into one of the three categories described above. These three categories are described in more detail in Sections 4.1.3.1 through 4.1.3.3 below.

#### 4.1.3.1 CEQA/NEPA Triggers

Projects, as defined by CEQA, are subject to CEQA environmental review. Projects include any activities that may cause a physical change in the environment and are 1) directly undertaken by a public agency; 2) supported by one or more federal agencies; or 3) involve an entitlement from one or more public agencies (CEQA Section 21065).

NEPA is triggered when a “major federal action” is undertaken by a federal agency or is wholly or partially funded by a federal agency (40 C.F.R Section 1508.18). A major federal action is an activity that has the potential to cause a significant impact on the human environment.

Activities that are not considered “projects” or “major federal actions” under CEQA or NEPA include administrative tasks, routine maintenance activities, funding mechanisms, or other fiscal activities, such as hiring additional park staff, maintaining existing facilities, or managing budgets. Aside from these activities; most of the proposed actions outlined in the Plan would trigger CEQA and/or NEPA.

#### 4.1.3.2 CEQA/NEPA Exemptions/Exclusions

Projects that would not have a significant effect on the environment are exempt from CEQA (CEQA Guidelines Section 15061). A significant effect is defined as “a substantial or potentially substantial, adverse change in the environment” (CEQA Section 21068). Minor activities associated with types of projects that do not normally have a significant environmental effect (Categorical Exemptions, CEQA Guidelines Sections 15301 through 15332) are also considered exempt.

A federal action is excluded from NEPA requirements if it falls into a category of actions that the federal agency has determined does not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment (Categorical Exclusions, 40 C.F.R Section 1508.4).

Proposed actions in the Plan that would likely be exempt/excluded from CEQA and NEPA include actions related to: protection or enhancement of biological, geological, water, cultural or aesthetic resources; acquisition of land for natural resource protection; installation of landscaping; operation, maintenance or repair of existing facilities; construction or replacement of signs, small parking lots, or lifeguard towers; enforcement of rules and regulations; minor excavation or dredging activities; protection of public safety; flood control activities; and any other actions that are determined not to have a significant environmental effect.

#### 4.1.3.3 Subsequent Projects

Master or tiered EIRs are intended to streamline later environmental review of projects or approvals included in the project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15175). Subsequent projects within the scope of the Master EIR are subject only to limited environmental review. Neither a new environmental document nor the preparation of findings are required of a subsequent project if the lead agency for the subsequent project is the lead agency for the Master EIR and the lead agency determines through an Initial Study that the subsequent project has no additional significant environmental effect, would require no additional mitigation or alternatives, and is within the scope of the Master EIR (CEQA Guidelines Section 15177).

Under NEPA, supplemental EISs are required when the agency makes substantial changes in the proposed action that affect environmental concerns or when significant new circumstances/information arise that affect environmental concerns and are relevant to the proposed action or its impacts (40 C.F.R. Section 1502.9).

Proposed actions that could be considered subsequent projects under the Plan/Master EIS/EIR include: expansion of pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle trails; creation of new trailheads or park access points; creation of new camp and picnic sites; small-scale construction of new recreational or interpretive facilities such as viewing platforms or gazebos; prescribed burning programs; utility improvements; or other activities that would not have an additional significant environmental effect, or require mitigation or alternatives outside the scope of the Master EIR/EIS.

### 4.1.4 Focus of the EIS/EIR . . .

## **4.1.5 ~~Environmental~~ Public Participation Review and EIR/EIS Certification Process**

. . . Upon certification of the Final EIS/EIR and approval of the Plan by Reclamation and State Parks, a Record of Decision and Notice of Determination will be prepared and filed with the Federal Register and State Clearinghouse. These will include a description of the project, the date of approval, and the address where the Final EIS/EIR and record of project approval are available for review.

## **4.3.2 Recommended Changes to Section 4.4- Environmental Consequences**

### Section 4.4.2 Environmental Effects Found Not to be Significant (pp. IV-80 and IV-81)

#### 4.4.2.6 Climate Change

##### *4.4.2.6.1 Background*

Climate change refers to changes in the global or a regional climate over time. These fluctuations are driven by processes that manipulate the greenhouse effect. Greenhouse gases in our atmosphere, such as carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide, keep the Earth's average surface temperature close to a hospitable 60 degrees Fahrenheit. Processes that influence the amounts of greenhouse gases include those internal to the Earth, various external, natural forces and, more recently, human activities.

Scientists have documented an overall warming trend since the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, with the decade of the 1990's being the warmest of the century. As the average temperature of the Earth increases, weather patterns are affected, and physical changes lead to impacts on California's public health, economy and ecology. In California, an area of considerable concern is the effect of climate change on the water supply, the majority of which is stored in the Sierra during the winter and spring as snow. Warmer winter temperatures could result in an increase of the amount of precipitation falling as rain and a reduced snow pack. Heavier rainfall could increase the risk of flooding. Another predicted outcome of climate change, a rise in sea level, is already being seen in California, with a 3 - 8 inch rise in the last century. Higher temperatures also cause an increase in harmful air emissions. The most predictable effect that climate change could have on the Unit is a change in the seasonal flow patterns (i.e., timing and amount) of the American River watershed, increasing the risk of flooding or water shortages during the summer and fall months.

Scientists have modeled potential near-term climate scenarios, but there is a large degree of uncertainty. On a State level, California can cut contributions to climate change by reducing traffic congestion, criteria air pollutants, and emissions of greenhouse gases from mobile sources. There is no significant environmental climate change impact related to management of the Unit that can be predicted given the current state of scientific knowledge. Plan guidelines, compliance with local air quality districts, and specific mitigation measures will help address the uncertainty regarding climate change and ensure that the Plan's proposed human activities do not significantly contribute to greenhouse gas concentrations. Thus, the proposed Plan would not contribute significantly to climate change.

#### *4.4.2.6.2 CEQA Thresholds of Significance*

No current CEQA regulation, statute or judicial decision delineates the method by which analysis of a project's greenhouse gas emissions impacts should be performed pursuant to CEQA. Senate Bill 97, adopted in August 2007, requires the State of California Office of Planning and Research to develop CEQA Guidelines for mitigating the effects of greenhouse gas emissions by July 1, 2009 to be certified and adopted by January 1, 2010. These prospective guidelines will provide needed direction for establishing significance criteria and reconciling the mandates of Assembly Bill No. 32 (AB32), the Global Warming Solutions Act, and rollback provisions under CEQA that do not require CEQA documents to mitigate for existing, pre-project conditions. As of January 2009, neither the California Air Resources Board (CARB) nor the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has identified a project-specific, significance threshold for analyzing the effects of greenhouse gases. On October 24, 2008, CARB released a Preliminary Draft Staff Proposal recommending approaches for setting interim significance thresholds for greenhouse gas emissions under CEQA as part of the "Climate Change Proposed Scoping Plan." However, no standard thresholds have yet been adopted.

A great deal of uncertainty exists regarding both the regulatory climate related to greenhouse gas emissions and the ability to quantify greenhouse gas emissions accurately. It is also premature to quantify or rely upon the effects of emission reduction measures that emanate from larger regional, state, federal and global regulatory mandates. In addition, CEQA is only one of many tools being used to approach the issue of greenhouse gas emissions and it is unclear to what extent CEQA documents may rely on other efforts, such as State or Air District measures adopted per AB 32.

Nonetheless, the EIR/EIS includes a qualitative assessment of the Plan's contribution to cumulative greenhouse gas emissions impacts. It does not include a calculation of the tons of

CO2 expected to be emitted as a result of Plan implementation, but focuses on whether or not the project is consistent with State and local policies related to greenhouse gases.

#### 4.4.2.6.3 Plan Contribution to Global Climate Change

The Plan is a broad planning document to guide future efforts to balance recreation and conservation, protect the natural and cultural resources, and expand opportunities for public enjoyment of the SRA. Although many of the proposed improvements in the Plan accommodate the existing population, development of new facilities and site improvements could also increase visitation to the park, resulting in potential global climate change impacts. These impacts could be associated with the following:: 1) an increase in the number of vehicle trips to and from the park; 2) an increase in energy use, water use, wastewater and solid waste generation within the park; 3) increased GHG emissions associated with expanded motorized boating activity; and 4) construction of proposed new facilities resulting in temporary increases in GHG emissions. However, the proposed Plan contains numerous goals and guidelines that would minimize potential global climate change impacts, including: protection, conservation, and restoration of natural habitat; promotion of non-motorized transportation through the expansion of pedestrian, equestrian and bicycle trails; promotion of public transit for accessing the SRA; expansion of the 5 mph boating zone; reduction of water and energy use; reduction of solid waste and consumption; and adherence to green building principles.

The biggest global climate change impact of the Plan would be in increase in vehicles accessing the park. The Plan includes goals and guidelines to reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT), particularly by encouraging users to access the SRA via the Light Rail Station in Folsom. By utilizing the Light Rail service, users reduce their dependence on private automobiles to access Lake Natoma. Users can take their bicycles onto the Light Rail, and through the trail system, access the various features and attractions in the park. In addition, State Parks could work with the City of Folsom and Sacramento Rapid Transit (RT) to promote a concession opportunity at the Light Rail Station(s) (or vicinity) to rent bicycles, kayaks, etc. to access park features. There may be other opportunities to provide incentives for park users to utilize Light Rail and decrease automobile dependency. Implementation of these concepts is consistent with the goals established by SACOG in the Preferred Blueprint Scenario of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan for 2035 for the region. The Blueprint aims to promote transit choices, while reducing greenhouse gas emissions and improving air quality as elements of the long-range transportation plan.

As shown in Table 3, the proposed Plan complies with local, regional and State regulations related to climate change (See Table 3 below). Therefore, the proposed Plan would not significantly contribute to global climate change.

**Table 3. Project Compliance to Applicable Global Climate Change Regulations**

Regulation	Project Compliance
<i>Energy Efficiency Measures</i>	
<p><b><u>Building Energy Efficiency Standards in Place and in Progress<sup>a</sup></u></b>  <u>Public Resources Code 25402 authorizes the Energy Commission to adopt and periodically update its building energy efficiency standards (that apply to newly constructed buildings and additions to and alterations to existing buildings).</u></p> <p><b><u>Energy Efficiency<sup>b</sup></u></b>  <u>Maximize energy efficiency building and appliance standards, and pursue additional efficiency efforts. Reductions could be achieved through enhancements to existing programs such as increased incentives and even more stringent building codes and appliance efficiency standards. Achieving significant GHG emissions from the building sector would require a combination of green building measures for new construction and existing buildings. Green buildings exceed minimum energy efficiency standards, decrease consumption of potable water, reduce solid waste during construction and operation, and incorporate sustainable and low-emitting materials that contribute to healthy indoor air quality</u></p>	<p><b><u>Compliant.</u></b> <u>All new and existing buildings would adhere to guidelines contained in the Plan to reduce use of energy and materials, reduce waste, and implement green building standards (Plan Guidelines SUSTAIN-3 through SUSTAIN-6).</u></p>
<i>Water Conservation and Efficiency Measures</i>	
<p><b><u>Water Use Efficiency<sup>a</sup></u></b>  <u>Approximately 19 percent of all electricity, 30 percent of all natural gas, and 88 million gallons of diesel are used to convey, treat, distribute and use water and wastewater. Increasing the efficiency of water transport and reducing water use would reduce GHG emissions.</u></p>	<p><b><u>Compliant.</u></b> <u>Implementation of the Plan would allow the development of additional facilities and site improvements that could generate increased demand for additional water. However, the proposed Plan contains guidelines to reduce overall consumption of water within the SRA, including: minimization of impervious surfaces; use of reclaimed or recycled water for landscape irrigation, fire protection, toilet flushing, wetlands recharge and outdoor water features; use of water-efficient irrigation design and systems for landscaping; and use of low-flow fixtures within buildings (SUSTAIN-2). Implementation of these guidelines would ensure compliance with water use regulations.</u></p>
<i>Solid Waste Reduction Measures</i>	
<p><b><u>Increase Waste Diversion, Composting, and Commercial Recycling, and Move Toward Zero-Waste</u></b>  <u>Increase waste diversion from landfills beyond the 50 percent mandate to provide for additional recovery of recyclable materials. Composting and commercial recycling could have substantial GHG reduction benefits. In the long term, zero-waste policies that</u></p>	<p><b><u>Compliant.</u></b> <u>Implementation of the Plan would allow the development of additional facilities and site improvements that could cause an increase in solid waste generation. However, the proposed Plan contains guidelines to reduce solid waste generation, including: reduction of material use; re-use of materials; recycling; use of re-used or recycled materials and renewable or recyclable materials in</u></p>

<p>would require manufacturers to design products to be fully recyclable may be necessary.</p>	<p>construction; and limiting paved areas (SUSTAIN-5). Implementation of these guidelines would ensure compliance with solid waste reduction regulations.</p>
<p><i>Transportation and Motor Vehicles</i></p>	
<p><b>Vehicle Climate Change Standards<sup>a</sup></b>  <u>AB 1493 (Pavley) required the State to develop and adopt regulations that achieve the maximum feasible and cost-effective reduction of GHG emissions from passenger vehicles and light duty trucks. Regulations were adopted by the CARB in September 2004.</u></p> <p><b>Light-Duty Vehicle Efficiency Measures</b>  <u>Implement additional measures that could reduce light-duty GHG emissions. For example, measures to ensure that tires are properly inflated can both reduce GHG emissions and improve fuel efficiency.</u></p> <p><b>Adopt Heavy- and Medium-Duty Fuel and Engine Efficiency Measures</b>  <u>Regulations to require retrofits to improve the fuel efficiency of heavy-duty trucks that could include devices that reduce aerodynamic drag and rolling resistance. This measure could also include hybridization of and increased engine efficiency of vehicles.</u></p> <p><b>Low Carbon Fuel Standard<sup>b</sup></b>  <u>CARB identified this measure as a Discrete Early Action Measure. This measure would reduce the carbon intensity of California's transportation fuels by at least 10% by 2020.</u></p>	<p><b>Compliant.</b> The Plan does not involve the <u>manufacture, sale, or purchase of vehicles. However, vehicles that operate within and access the park would comply with any vehicle and fuel standards adopted by the CARB.</u></p>
<p><b>Measures to Improve Transportation Energy Efficiency<sup>b</sup></b>  <u>Builds on current efforts to provide a framework for expanded and new initiatives, including incentives, tools, and information that advance cleaner transportation and reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</u></p> <p><b>SACOG Blueprint Growth Principles</b>  <u>The Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Blueprint Growth Principles encourage project design that encourages people to walk, bicycle, use public transit or car pool to reach the project site.</u></p>	<p><b>Compliant.</b> Increased visitor capacity resulting from Plan implementation could result in an increase in <u>vehicle trips to and from the SRA. The Plan contains broad direction encouraging use of alternate modes of transportation to access the SRA (CIRCULATE-4 and CIRCULATE-5), as well as specific guidelines for linking the SRA with public transit (CIRCULATE-9 through CIRCULATE-11) and pedestrian and bicycle facilities (VISIT-36 through VISIT-38; VISIT-48). In addition, many other guidelines for trail and facility development encourage non-motorized recreation within the SRA. Implementation of these guidelines would ensure compliance with transportation efficiency regulations.</u></p>
<p><b>Anti-Idling Enforcement.</b> <u>CARB adopted a diesel particulate air toxic control measure in June 2004 to control idling of diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles. Enforcement commenced the following year. This rule prohibits, with some exceptions, the idling of diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicles for more than 5 minutes, and applies to both trucks and buses greater than 10,000 lbs gross vehicle weight.</u></p>	<p><b>Compliant.</b> Vehicles used for construction and operation within the park would comply with all <u>anti-idling regulations, including CARB's limits on diesel-fueled commercial motor vehicle idling.</u></p>

<sup>a</sup> California Environmental Protection Agency, 2006. *Climate Action Team Report to Governor Schwarzenegger and the Legislature*. March.

<sup>b</sup> California Air Resources Board, 2008. *Climate Change Draft Scoping Plan: a framework for change*. June.

<sup>c</sup> California Environmental Protection Agency, 2006. *Climate Action Team Report to Governor Schwarzenegger and the Legislature*. March

Section 4.4.3.1 Aesthetics/Visual Resources: Affected Environment (pp. IV-84-85)*4.4.3.1.4 Elements Detracting from Scenic Resources and Visual Quality*

...Other development within the Unit that detracts from the overall visual quality includes utilities. There are several locations within the Unit where utility lines interrupt the scenic landscape and reduce the quality of views from significant vista points. The main utility through the Unit is the Western Area Power Administration high-tension electrical transmission line between the Nimbus Dam substation to the Folsom Dam substation. Clearly visible from several vantage points in the Mississippi Bar and Negro Bar areas, the towers and overhead lines are significant foreground features when viewed from Lake Natoma and the Lake Overlook. Other structures and utilities that affect visual quality include the State Parks and Reclamation corporation yards located on Folsom Dam Road, the Reclamation yard located on the western shore of Lake Natoma below the Lake Overlook, the El Dorado Irrigation District raw water pump station and associated facilities, and raw water mains from the pump station to the El Dorado Hills Water Treatment Plant. These facilities are poorly screened from their surroundings and lend an industrial feel to the area.

Section 4.4.8.1 Land Use: Affected Environment (pp. IV-237 and IV-238)

## NON-RECREATION LAND USE IN THE UNIT

The damming of the American River at Folsom in 1956, part of the massive Central Valley Project, resulted in the creation of Folsom Lake and Lake Natoma behind the Folsom and Nimbus Dams. The primary non-recreation land uses within the Unit, these dams operate both lakes for the purposes of flood control, water supply, and power generation. As a result, recreation use in the Unit is closely related to the function of Folsom Lake as a reservoir since water levels directly affect the availability of boat ramps, beaches, mooring sites, and other facilities that depend largely on water depth or surface area. A number of past flood protection and water supply projects and proposed future projects have and will continue to affect the operation of Folsom Dam and water levels on the reservoir, including the Folsom Reservoir Re-operation, the Joint Federal Project and increased water diversions by various entities as outlined in the Water Forum Agreement. The Water Forum Agreement provides for increased surface water diversions to meet planned growth in the area through 2030 and to ensure that customer demand can be met in dry years. Increased diversions would result in lower water levels on Folsom Lake and directly affect boating and swimming opportunities in the Unit. Other non-recreational land uses within the Unit include the State Parks and Reclamation corporation yards, the Reclamation yard located on the western shore

of Lake Natoma below the Lake Overlook, the El Dorado Irrigation District raw water pump station and associated facilities, and raw water mains from the pump station to the El Dorado Hills Water Treatment Plant.

Section 4.4.11.3.1 Air Quality: Impacts (pp. IV-336)

**Mitigation Measure AIRQ-2a:** The PCAPD has not established any emissions threshold for construction activities associated with a proposed project. They only state that implementation of standard conditions and feasible measures to minimize emissions during construction of the project shall be considered to have reduced the construction air quality impact to a less than significant level. The EDCAPCD and SMAQMD have both established emission thresholds for construction activities as shown in Table 11.G. No Plan-related construction emissions exceedances are expected, as shown in Table 11.G, so no additional mitigation measures shall be required for these latter two air districts.

The project shall comply with regional rules that assist in reducing short-term air pollutant emissions as applicable: Rule 228 for Fugitive Dust Control (PCAPCD), Rule 223 for Fugitive Dust Control (EDCAPCD), and Rule 403 for Fugitive Dust Control (SMAQMD). Standard district rules require that fugitive dust be controlled with best available control measures so that the presence of such dust does not remain visible in the atmosphere beyond the property line of the mission source. In addition, implementation of dust suppression techniques is required to prevent fugitive dust from creating a nuisance off site. Dust control measures applicable to the appropriate governing agency will be determined for future projects identified by the Plan. Implementation of the dust suppression techniques can reduce the fugitive dust generation (and thus the PM<sub>10</sub> component). Compliance with these rules shall reduce impacts on nearby sensitive receptors.

Emissions associated with architectural coatings shall be reduced by complying with the standards established by the EDCAPCD, PCAPCD, and SMAQMD, which include using pre-coated/natural colored building materials.

The SRA is located in a nonattainment area for ozone and fine particulate matter (p. IV-320). Future construction-related emissions of nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), a precursor for ozone, and particulate matter less than 10 and 2.5 microns in diameter (PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub>) could exacerbate nonattainment air quality standards and contribute to adverse cumulative air quality impacts (p. IV-394). Emissions control measures will be necessary to reduce these construction emissions. In addition to all applicable local, state, or federal requirements, the following emissions control measures shall be implemented:

*Fugitive Dust Source Controls:*

- Stabilize open storage piles and disturbed areas by covering and/or applying water or chemical/organic dust palliative where appropriate. This applies to both inactive and active sites, during workdays, weekends, holidays, and windy conditions.
- Install wind fencing and phase grading operations where appropriate, and operate water trucks for stabilization of surfaces under windy conditions.
- When hauling material and operating non-earthmoving equipment, prevent spillage and limit speeds to 15 miles per hour (mph). Limit speed of earthmoving equipment to 10 mph.

*Mobile and Stationary Source Controls:*

- Reduce use, trips, and unnecessary idling from heavy equipment.
- Redistribute material hauling and disposal to minimize haulage miles.
- Maintain and tune engines per manufacturer's specifications to perform at EPA certification levels and to perform at verified standards applicable to retrofit technologies. Employ periodic, unscheduled inspections to limit unnecessary idling and to ensure that construction equipment is properly maintained, tuned, and modified consistent with established specifications.
- Prohibit any tampering with engines and require continuing adherence to manufacturer's recommendations.
- If practicable, lease new, clean equipment meeting the most stringent of applicable Federal or State Standards. In general, only Tier 2 or newer engines should be employed in the construction phase.
- Utilize EPA-registered particulate traps and other appropriate controls where suitable to reduce emissions of diesel particulate matter and other pollutants at the construction site.
- Use electrical power for all stationary equipment.
- Use the most recent pollutant control equipment for all off-road equipment.

*Administrative Controls:*

- Identify all commitments to reduce construction emissions and update the air quality analysis to reflect additional air quality improvements that would result from adopting specific air quality measures.
- Identify where implementation of mitigation measures is rejected based on economic infeasibility.
- Prepare an inventory of all equipment prior to construction and identify the suitability of add-on emission controls for each piece of equipment before groundbreaking.  
(Suitability of control devices is based on: whether there is reduced normal availability of

the construction equipment due to increased downtime and/or power output, whether there may be significant damage caused to the construction equipment engineer, or whether there may be significant damage caused to the construction equipment engine, or whether there may be a significant risk to nearby workers or the public.) Utilize cleanest available fuel engines in construction equipment and identify opportunities for I electrification. Use ultra low sulfur fuel (diesel with 15 parts per million or less) in engines where alternative fuels such as biodiesel and natural gas are not possible.

- Develop a construction traffic and parking management plan that minimizes traffic interference and maintains traffic flow.
- Identify sensitive receptors in the project area, such as children, elderly, and infirm, and specify the means by which you will minimize impacts to these populations. For example, locate construction equipment and staging zones away from sensitive receptors and fresh air intakes to buildings and air conditioners.
- Identification of available air quality emissions credits.
- Scheduling and sequencing work so there is not a significant overlap with other activities that contribute to air quality emissions.

#### Section 4.4.14.1 Utilities and Service Systems: Affected Environment (p. IV-377)

. . . Several companies and agencies own utility lines that pass through the Unit. State Parks and Reclamation have granted easements to utility owners that guarantee them permanent access to pipelines or transmission lines for maintenance and repair purposes. Typically, State Parks and Reclamation are not responsible for maintenance of these easements. Development within these easements is prohibited; however, new roads, trails and utilities can be constructed across easements provided permission has been granted. Each utility owner adopts its own policy for vegetation removal, tree trimming, and easement maintenance. These policies are not always consistent with those of State Parks. Furthermore, the expansion plans of two utility owners – the San Juan Water District and the El Dorado Irrigation District – may affect future Unit land use. Entities with major utility easements include PG&E, City of Roseville, San Juan Water District, Western Area Power Administration, Sacramento Municipal Utility District, El Dorado Irrigation District and the City of Folsom. In addition to their utility easements, the El Dorado Irrigation District also operates the Folsom Lake Raw Water Pump Station and associated facilities, and raw water mains from the pump station to the El Dorado Hills Water Treatment Plant.

This page left blank.

# CHAPTER 5.0 – REPORT PREPARATION

## 5.1 FINAL EIR PREPARERS

### **California Department of Parks and Recreation**

Jim Micheals, Senior Park and Recreation Specialist, General Plan Responses

### **U.S. Department of the Interior-Bureau of Reclamation**

Laura Caballero, Environmental Specialist

### **Wallace, Roberts & Todd, LLC-Prime Consultant**

Stephen Hammond, Principal

### **LSA Associates, Inc.**

Bill Mayer, Principal Environmental Planner, CEQA/NEPA Oversight

Laura Lafler, Principal Environmental Planner, Project Manager

Shanna Guiler, Senior Planner, Document Organization and EIR/EIS Responses

Megan Heileman, Assistant Planner, Document Organization and EIR/EIS Responses

Tony Chung, Principal/Air Quality and Acoustical Specialist, EIR/EIS Air Quality and Noise Responses

Ron Brugger, Air Quality Specialist, EIR/EIS Air Quality Responses

Tony Petros, Principal Traffic Consultant, EIR/EIS Traffic and Transportation Responses

Megan Macias, Associate Traffic Consultant, EIR/EIS Traffic and Transportation Responses