

# 7 Recommendations, Priorities, Regulatory Requirements, and Conclusions

This chapter contains recommendations developed through the course of performing the site and facilities analysis (Chapter 2), opportunities and constraints analysis (Chapter 3), recreation needs analysis (Chapter 4), management coordination analysis (Chapter 5), and law enforcement coordination analysis (Chapter 6). This chapter begins with a brief review of the context for recommendations and priorities based on the analyses. Following this are recommendations for public recreation access facilities and amenities in the Sacramento River study corridor extending from Red Bluff to Colusa. The third section includes recommendations pertaining to the focus sites of this study, including a recommendation for the development of a “Pine Creek Preserve.” The fourth section includes recommendations for the development of programs to plan for and support existing and increased recreation use of the area. The fifth section covers permitting and regulatory requirements related to recreation facilities and amenities development and maintenance. The sixth section includes recommendations for further evaluation of the potential for new recreation opportunities within the region, and the final section includes conclusions of this study.

The recommendations of this study are primarily directed to the various public agencies and private entities that own and manage recreation and conservation property within the study area. Key public agencies include the federal agencies (Bureau of Land Management [BLM], U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS], and U.S. Forest Service), State of California agencies (the Departments of Boating and Waterways, Fish and Game [DFG], Parks and Recreation [DPR], and the Reclamation Board [Reclamation Board]), the counties of Butte, Colusa, Glenn and Tehama and the cities of Colusa and Tehama. Key private entities include the Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum (Forum), The Nature Conservancy (TNC), and the Sacramento River Partners. These recommendations identify opportunities for improving and expanding recreation opportunities that relate to the continuing preservation and enhancement of the ecosystem along the Sacramento River corridor. Some of the recommendations can be accomplished by a single entity, however the majority of the recommendations will require coordinated action on the part of multiple entities.

Final determinations as to whether an individual property should be open to a particular use or developed with specific improvements will be made by the owners and managers of the various properties along the river. These determinations will often be made as part of management plans and follow-up implementation actions. The USFWS’s Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP) for the Sacramento River National Wildlife Refuge (SRNWR) is an example of such a

management plan. Such large-scale management planning efforts will require more site-specific information and additional public input as to the practicality and desirability of a particular course of action. The property owner and manager must also consider its available resources and the multiple tradeoffs that are cited in this study. Given those involved considerations, this study does not attempt to prejudge these future processes. Instead it makes more general recommendations intended to stimulate new considerations and ideas, while leaving room for balancing the many, complex factors that must be considered as part of an appropriate, public process.

## **7.1 Public Recreation Access Recommendations Setting**

Public demand for natural area recreation activities and population growth both locally and within the region are clearly going to increase the need for recreation opportunities within the study area. Recreation trend analyses in this study indicate a significant growing demand for non-traditional outdoor recreation uses, with an expected increase of 65% in the next 40 years within the Pacific Coast region. Input gathered during meetings and interviews with interest groups support indications for such demand. These activities include recreation pursuits such as bird watching, wildlife viewing, nature observation, and hiking. The attraction for people to enjoy the outdoors is primarily to enjoy the natural beauty of an area. However, while demand related to hiking and non-traditional recreation uses exists in the area, opportunities do not meet the demand. Other recreation activities such as camping, picnicking, and fishing were identified as having high demand in the study area, but are lacking in terms of facilities. Uses such as non-motorized boating (e.g., canoeing and kayaking), and bicycling are potentially popular activities that are under-represented in the study area.

Public access is an issue of substantial concern in the study area with opinions expressed both for and against increased access. Public access is desired in the form of additional boat facilities and road access to the river or to and through public lands, primarily in southern portions of the study area where they are lacking. However, conservation goals that make the area more attractive to recreation users also necessarily limit opportunities for public access on public lands that are subject to mandates to achieve wildlife protection and population recovery goals. In addition, private landowners have concerns about the potential for increased trespassing. As a result, public access in certain areas, primarily the southern subreaches, will need to be carefully planned to strike a balance between recreation use, other human uses, landowner concerns, and programs for the protection and restoration of the dynamic Sacramento River system.

According to a 1997 statewide recreation study (DPR 1998) discussed in Chapter 4, several locally available, or potential available recreation activities in the study area are among those that are the most popular among participants from a regional 24-county area including, the local

study area, adjacent counties, and the greater San Francisco Bay and Delta and Sacramento region. In order of popularity, from highest to lowest, these include recreational walking, visiting museums and historic sites, trail hiking, driving for pleasure, picnicking at developed sites, using grass/turf areas, attending outdoor cultural events, camping in developed sites, visiting beaches, and swimming in lakes, rivers, ocean, general nature study and wildlife viewing, and bicycling on paved surfaces. All have a participation rate of greater than 50%. Some activities, though not as popular at the prior set, are noteworthy in that they are much more popular in the local four-county area (including Red Bluff to Colusa) than in the larger, regional area. These include hunting (17% locally vs. 8% regionally) and power boating (45% locally vs. 25% regionally). Over 90% of overall (local and regional) study area residents visited “natural and undeveloped areas” and “nature-oriented parks and recreation areas” with most (65% or more) indicating they visit these settings at least several times per year.

Estimates of considerable population increases over the next two decades will need to be considered at both local and regional levels when planning for recreation access in the Sacramento River corridor. Population growth within the local 4-county area is expected to increase by 170,000 new residents (55% increase) in the next two decades, compared to an increase of 2,287,000 new residents (25% increase) in the regional 20-county (i.e., excluding the 4-counties) area. About half of the local area growth is expected to occur in Butte County, with Colusa, Glenn and Tehama counties sharing the remaining growth. While the more significant growth estimates are in metropolitan areas, these growth areas are within a relatively short driving distance from the study area.

As part of recreation access and facilities planning, resource managers will need to consider both Caucasian and Hispanic populations as part of both the local and regional areas. Hispanic populations include just under one-half of the residents of Colusa County and approximately one-third of the residents of Glenn County. Butte and Tehama County have approximately 11% and 16% Hispanic populations, respectively. These findings indicate that information and education efforts should be multi-lingual, taking into consideration a diversity of local cultures and needs based on ethnic-affiliation.

With the increasing beauty wildlife value, and recreation demands, comes an ever increasing need for formalized coordination among land management agencies to enhance the ability of recreation visitors to access the river, and to plan recreation opportunities that will complement the natural character of the river corridor. Increased social pressures and use will also make greater demands on the area’s law enforcement and emergency services, requiring increased coordination among land managers and law enforcement entities in the region to plan for a healthy and safe recreation setting.

## 7.2 General Recommendations for Recreation Access Facilities and Amenities

It is recommended that public recreation access be encouraged where it is most needed and where it would have the least impact in terms of the river's natural dynamic functionality and resources. Consistent with this recommendation, additional areas could be opened and improved to accommodate increased public access, while other areas could remain closed to recreation access to preserve and protect the natural resources, character and functions of the dynamic river corridor and to protect private landowners. The locations of public recreation facilities and amenities in the study area should be based on existing and potential public recreation demand for the area, the mission and goals of the agency or private land trust owning the land, the dynamics and values of the river system, and stakeholder and landowner interests in the area.

Following are recreation facilities and amenities recommendations and priorities based on this study.

### 7.2.1 Public Road Access

Public road access is most available within the upper three subreaches of the study area, covering a span of 32 river miles, and most limited in the southern subreaches, between Colusa and Princeton (15 river miles, both sides), between Packer Lake and Ord Bend (16 river miles, right side), and between SRWA Princeton Unit East and the Bidwell-Sacramento River State Park Big Chico Creek Day Use Area (30 river miles, left side).

Recommendations for public road access improvements include:

**7.2.1 – A. Consider acquiring new public rights-of-way.** Acquisition of new public rights-of way should be considered and pursued to and through land where:

- recreation uses are consistent with the mission and goals of the public or private landowner,
- the land is located adjacent to or within 1/4 mile of an existing public road,
- there is sufficient area for parking, and
- the adjoining landowners are willing to grant public rights-of-way through their land.

**7.2.1 – B. Consider specific locations for public access.** Consideration of new public access points should focus on the southern portion of the study area where public road access is most limited. There are eight possible, future public access locations

between Ord Bend and Colusa. Seven of these sites, which are owned by USFWS, DFG, and the Reclamation Board, are within 500 feet or less of a public road. The potential of acquiring additional access rights should be evaluated in regard to the opportunities and constraints noted in Chapter 3.

**7.2.1 – C. Consider other facilities at public access sites.** Provision for other appurtenances, such as toilet and picnic facilities, should also be considered for each site, as appropriate, depending on the nature of the allowable recreation uses and the characteristics and sensitivity (e.g., flooding, meander zone, cultural resources, biological resources) of the site.

## **7.2.2 Boating Facilities**

Inaccessibility of boat ramps or marinas is a major concern of river users in the area, including both recreational boaters and law enforcement personnel. Coordination between the agencies that operate boat launch facilities is an important key to resolving the problems. In addition, as the population within the study area and larger region continues to grow there will be a need for additional boat ramp facilities and coordination among public and private facility owners and operators, and agencies involved in planning, funding and maintaining boating facilities.

Functional boat ramps and marinas are most available in northern subreaches of the study area, and most limited in the southern subreaches, just as with public road access. Major gaps in the availability of boat facilities occur between Scotty's Boat Landing near Hamilton City and Ord Bend (approximately 12 river miles), and between Ord Bend and Colusa (approximately 40 river miles, primarily because of the loss of function of ramps at Colusa and Butte City). The most urgent need for accessible boat facilities occurs in the Colusa area, because of the inaccessibility of the ramps located at the Colusa-Sacramento River State Recreation Area and the old Cruise n' Tarry Marina site. Two other ramps are closed periodically during the boating season because of substantial siltation: the Colusa-Sacramento River State Recreation Area and the Butte City Launch Facility.

The high degree of demand for boat facilities in the study area makes this need a high priority for consideration. Recommendations for improvements regarding boat facilities include:

**7.2.2 – A. Evaluate need for new and renovated boat facilities.** The Forum should sponsor an analysis of the boat launch facilities in the southern portion of the study area, from Ord Bend to Colusa. It will be important for agencies that operate the existing ramps to coordinate with each other and the Department of Boating and Waterways to determine the most appropriate and feasible plans for renovating existing facilities and/or building new ones. The renovation of existing facilities and the location of new ones should be evaluated in terms of current and anticipated future demand within the subreach considered, and the

proximity to other public and private boat ramps, as well as the long-term plans for those ramps. Additional important factors to consider include the anticipated stability of the ramp or marina in terms of current and predicted future river dynamics (i.e., siltation and meander trends), and anticipated maintenance costs. New facilities may best be located near “hard points,” such as highways and bridges that are likely to be protected from changes in the river course. Doing so could also minimize the introduction of new hard points that constrain the river and are costly to maintain.

**7.2.2 – B. Consider specific new boat facilities sites.** One potential location for a new boat facility is on the Glenn County side of the old Princeton Ferry site. This site is under consideration by the USFWS, DFG and Glenn County. A boat ramp at that location would be especially useful if it is not feasible to open and maintain the channel at the Butte City Launch Facility. The Princeton Ferry site is accessible by public roads and there is adequate space around the ramp to develop parking facilities. The ramp itself should be evaluated for widening to provide more room for maneuvering boats and trailers.

**7.2.2 – C. Consider renovation of specific boat facilities.** There is a need to renovate the Wildlife Conservation Board boat ramp at City Park in Red Bluff. During periods when the gates at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam (RBDD) are open (currently September 15 to May 15) there is no boat launch access to the river in the Red Bluff area, except below the Dam. There needs to be a new design for the ramp that will provide access to the river at a wide range of flows, as well as to Lake Red Bluff during the summer months when the RBDD gates are closed (Cepello 2003).

**7.2.2 – D. Research and evaluate new facility designs.** The Department of Boating and Waterways is considering a floating ramp and dock design within the study area. Designs such as this should be evaluated and monitored along with research into other successful designs in similar dynamic alluvial river systems. The objectives for the research and evaluations should include working with the natural patterns of the river, reducing long-term maintenance costs, and increasing the lifespan of the project. Current estimated costs for building new boat ramps is \$50,000 for a single lane, concrete boat ramp. Floating ramp and dock type ramp costs are not estimated in this study.

**7.2.2 – E. Research and review alternative maintenance approaches.** Measures to reduce the maintenance cost for boat facilities over the long term should be investigated and implemented. The process should incorporate technical advice from resource agencies and organizations participating in the conservation activity on the river and the planning, funding, development and maintenance of boat facilities, including the Department of Boating and Waterways, the Wildlife Conservation Board, resource agencies, and local facility operators and managers. The annual dredging cost for single lane ramp is estimated at \$6,000.

**7.2.2 – F. Streamline permitting.** Local agencies and the Department of Boating and Waterways should coordinate to streamline the permit process for maintaining the functionality of boat facilities. Coordination may enable the acquisition of “umbrella” and “programmatic” types of permits that cover more than one site and allow for repeated maintenance activities over a period of years. The permit approval process can take time. As such, it is recommended that the process be started early enough to obtain permit approval in time to complete the work during the appropriate season for boat facility maintenance activities. Permitting and regulatory requirements are discussed in Section 7.4.

**7.2.2 – G. Increase outreach.** When boat facilities will be closed for any length of time during the boating season, information should be provided at the closed facility and distributed throughout the region with respect to other boat facilities that are open. This information could be provided in the form of a brochure given to sporting goods stores, local resorts, and other facilities; newspaper announcements; Department of Boating and Waterways or other local guidebooks and maps; and website announcements.

**7.2.2 – H. Consider establishing “Boating Coordinator” position.** It may be most effective and efficient for the various agencies that operate boat ramps to pool their resources to create a regional “Boating Coordinator” position whose functions would be to:

- coordinate with all public and private agencies, law enforcement, and public and private facility operators;
- acquire the necessary permits for the channel dredging ;
- administer and manage consultant and construction contracts for the construction of new facilities and the renovation and maintenance of existing facilities;
- plan and oversee development and maintenance of a consistent river signage system;
- develop a boat trail system; and
- coordinate and disseminate information to the public regarding boating activities and facilities, and adjacent land access, facilities and amenities.

**7.2.2 – I. Consider establishing “Boat Trail” system.** The river offers a unique opportunity for use as a boat trail because there are numerous places to stop and to set up primitive camps on gravel beaches below the ordinary high-water mark (OHWM). Designation of the river as a boat trail could also have beneficial effects for the tourist industry in the area in attracting recreational users. The boat trail may result in increased use both by motorized (e.g., powerboats, jet skis, fishing boats) and non-motorized (e.g.,

kayaks, canoes) boaters. Planning safety areas (e.g., speed limits) could be useful to improve safety if and where hazardous conditions are likely.

### **7.2.3 Signage, Kiosks, and Outreach**

The need for outreach and signage was mentioned repeatedly during interviews with managers and interest groups and during public meetings. The lack of signage was stated to be a contributing factor to trespassing. Repeatedly mentioned was the difficulty in knowing where you are when boating on the river. Outreach is needed on publicly accessible lands to help communicate the mission of the landowner and other important information. Interpretive signage can provide opportunities for environmental and cultural education on public lands.

Recommendations for signage, kiosks and outreach in the study area include:

**7.2.3 – A. Provide maps and brochures or guidebooks.** Provide comprehensive, updateable, widely distributed public maps and brochures, pamphlets, or guidebooks, and website information including the location of public access on the river, directions to the listed sites, and road intersections, and landmarks. The information should be consistent with the accepted river mile convention and river signage. Standard geo-positioning system (GPS) reference points should also be included. This guidebook could also include information on where public access is allowed below the OHWM. Additional information provided should include facilities, services and activities available or allowed on different agencies' lands. The guidebook may be developed by or in coordination with the Department of Boating and Waterways with the involvement of local entities. They may be best to develop following completion of the CCP by the USFWS for their Refuge. The Sacramento River Access website, developed under contract to DWR, will be a first step toward this recommendation.

**7.2.3 – B. Provide river and roadway signage.** Provide a consistent, clear, aesthetically-pleasing and easily maintainable system of signage along the river and roads. This should include identification and boundaries of private and public property, agency ownership, and public access to help bicyclists, motorists, and boaters navigate and use facilities, and to reduce trespassing. Where feasible, signage could be provided to indicated OHWM boundary indicating where public access is allowed.

**7.2.3 – C. Develop a multi-agency visitor center and/or kiosks.** Develop a multi-agency visitor center and/or kiosks at public access points, including the mission of the landowner, site values and sensitivities, basic contact information, emergency and reporting information, facilities and services, and recreational opportunities, restrictions, and events.

**7.2.3 – D. Disseminate outreach materials.** Disseminate outreach information at hotels, chambers of commerce, equipment stores, museums, historic sites, websites, and

newspapers. Updated newsletters or announcements should be considered along with brochures and maps. These could include information on changes in ownership and land management and new or closed facilities.

**7.2.3 – E. Provide interpretive signage.** Consider providing interpretive signage to provide an educational component to the visitor experience on public sites with trails, especially those with special environmental significance.

**7.2.3 – F. Seek funding for signage and outreach programs.** The development and implementation of a comprehensive signage and outreach program should be the subject of public and private funding and/or grant proposals.

#### **7.2.4 Camping Facilities**

Camping in developed campgrounds is one of the most popular recreation activities among people in the study area. However, the demand for primitive camping opportunities is much lower than for developed campgrounds. The demand for developed campground facilities is expected to increase as the regional population grows. The current demand may be greatest in the northern and southern reaches of the study area.

Some developed campground facilities are available in the northern portion of the study area between Woodson Bridge and Red Bluff. However, in the southern portion of the study area, campsites are absent for approximately 50 river miles between Colusa and DPR's Irvine Finch River Access facility on the right side of the river, and between Colusa and Scotty's Boat Landing on the left side of the river. Primitive boat camping is generally available in the study area, but is limited to gravel bars below the ordinary high-water mark anywhere on the river. Campground development is inconsistent with the missions of the SRNWR and the Sacramento River Wildlife Area (SRWA) which own much of the public property within the southern subreaches, and there is no substantial opportunity to develop on the existing DPR sites in the area.

Recommendations to improve camping opportunities within the study area include:

**7.2.4 – A. Develop new campground facilities.** Consider developing new campground facilities near the river in locations where there is public demand, and where it is compatible with the goals, interests and concerns of public and private landowners in the vicinity of proposed sites. Locations for developed campgrounds, including restrooms, paved or maintained roadways, and picnic pad sites should be located in stable areas where erosion is unlikely. If the sites are to be located adjacent to the river, they should be developed with seasonal flooding in mind, yet function to provide camping opportunities during the summer and fall. Suitable areas for developed campgrounds could include natural woodland areas away from but accessible to and from the river. Suitable protected areas adjacent to the

river could include naturally stable banks, or areas adjacent to hard points such as road bridges that have low traffic volume. Restrictions on the types of facilities that can be developed in the flood zone, as well as maintenance costs, will likely limit the type and location of picnic facilities and associated parking lots (i.e., dirt versus paved) or restrooms (i.e., portable toilet versus building) in the study area.

**7.2.4 – B. Consider developing campgrounds (County Parks).** When feasible, county parks departments should consider developing and managing campgrounds, possibly in conjunction with multi-purpose river park facilities (see Section 7.2.9). This would maximize the opportunity to meet public demand for camping in a river setting in which there are limited opportunities because of the instability of a dynamic naturally functioning river system.

**7.2.4 – C. Consider designating primitive camping sites.** Consider designation of a limited number of primitive camping sites on public lands where it is consistent with the goals for the property. Primitive camping doesn't require the development of permanent facilities (portable outhouses may be needed), although permits could be required to limit the amount of use. The largest demand for this type of facility may be along the river for boat camping.

## **7.2.5 Bank Fishing Access**

Bank fishing is a very popular recreational activity that is expected to increase substantially over the next few decades. In addition, as fish spawning and rearing habitat is improved in the Sacramento River watershed and Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, fish populations can be expected to increase, creating more opportunities for fishing. For fishermen who don't have access to fishing boats, bank fishing may be the only way to participate in this activity.

Recommendations for improving bank fishing access include the following:

**7.2.5 – A. Provide roadside fishing access sites.** Consider providing pullouts or wide shoulders in areas where the riverbank and generally good fishing sites are adjacent to roads, both to improve access and to reduce potential traffic hazards.

**7.2.5 – B. Provide new fishing trails.** Consider providing trails through a publicly owned site to the river's edge where public roads or rights-of way provide access to, but not through, the property, particularly where vegetation is fairly dense. Such trails would need to be consistent with the mission of the landowner and in a potentially popular fishing location. However, where trails are provided, it is less likely that those trying to get to the riverbank will open new trails through sensitive areas. Costs for installing bladed dirt trails, 4 feet wide are estimated at \$1 to \$4 per linear foot. However, costs can vary widely based on the gradient and other site conditions. Costs for multi-use trails are included in Section 7.2.7.1.

**7.2.5 – C. Consider improving specific fishing access locations.** One potential location to consider improving public access may be to the riffle near the Interstate 5 bridge north of Red Bluff. This is a popular fishing spot when the gates at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam are open, however the legality of access to the site needs to be resolved. Another potential location to improve public access is to the large gravel bar adjacent to City Park in Red Bluff just below the Antelope Bridge (Cepello 2003).

## **7.2.6 Hunting Access**

Although hunting is expected to decline in general, it remains a more popular activity in the study area than in the larger Sacramento and San Francisco Bay and Delta region. As habitat is improved on established and recently acquired conservation lands in the area, the size and variety of wildlife populations can be expected to improve, creating more opportunities for hunting.

Hunting is allowed seasonally at all of the sites that comprise DFG's SRWA. The SRWA sites are distributed throughout the study area corridor with the exception of the Red Bluff/Los Molinos Subreach. Hunting is not allowed on SRNWR sites pending a determination as part of the CCP. Hunting is also not allowed on any other publicly owned land in the study area. Recommendations to enhance hunting access include:

**7.2.6 – A. Consider new road access for hunting areas.** Consider developing additional public road access to areas where hunting is allowed on public lands (See Section 7.2.1).

## **7.2.7 Non-Motorized Trails and Nature Observation**

In addition to trails needed for fishing and hunting, trails and paths are especially needed for other non-motorized activities, primarily trails for nature observation, but also paths for bicycling, and horseback riding. Nature observation, including nature observation wildlife activities such as general wildlife viewing, bird watching, and wildlife photography, is one of the most popular recreational activities in the study area and region. Public interest in nature viewing is expected to increase substantially over the next four decades. Nature observation opportunities in the study area are expected to improve as bird and wildlife populations increase in response to habitat improvements on established and recently acquired conservation lands in the area. As populations in the region grow, increased demand can also be expected for bicycle and equestrian paths along the river corridor.

Nature observation opportunities, especially bird watching, are typically available at accessible sites in the study area, but accessible sites are generally lacking in the southern portions of the study area where much of the publicly owned land is managed for conservation goals. Foot trails in the study region may be insufficient to meet current and future demand for the area. In addition, foot trails that are available on SWRA lands may not be safely usable for nature

observation recreation activities during the hunting season. Motor boats and jet skis also limit bird watching and wildlife viewing because of the substantial amount of noise that interferes with hearing bird calls or can cause wildlife to move away.

The high demand for trails and nature observation opportunities along with the projected increased demand in the future make this facility and amenity group a high priority for consideration. Recommendations for non-motorized trails and nature observation include:

**7.2.7 – A. Develop multi-use trail at proposed Hamilton City setback levee.** Plan for a multi-use trail on the proposed setback levee in the Hamilton City area. The facility offers the potential to plan for access rights and develop a facility that is entirely on public property with good public road access at two points. The new trail could include extensions through riparian areas to connect to the river.

**7.2.7 – B. Evaluate feasibility of new multi-use trails on public land.** Evaluate the feasibility of establishing Class 1, non-motorized, multi-use trails for pedestrians, equestrians and bicycles on contiguous publicly owned land. Consider adding trails on public lands where use of trails for nature observation and hiking would be consistent with conservation, outreach, and other goals for the properties.

**7.2.7 – C. Evaluate multi-use trail potential on Sacramento River Flood Control Project levees.** Evaluate the potential for establishing a multi-use trail(s) along Sacramento River Flood Control Project levees that are owned by the state or a local agency, or where landowners would grant public access easements. One such stretch that could be evaluated as a pilot project is the levee north of Butte City. The Butte City Boat Launch Facility, located at the south end of the levee, could be used as a trailhead.

**7.2.7 – D. Evaluate feasibility of multi-use trail and bike path connecting public roadways and levee paths.** Evaluate the feasibility for establishment of an interconnected multi-use trail and bike path system, encompassing bike paths created along existing public roadways and trails through public land to levee paths.

**7.2.7 – E. Develop multi-level nature observation decks.** Consider developing multi-level observation decks so that visitors can enjoy different perspectives of the environment. Some locations to consider for observation decks include the edge of a slough, the confluence of a creek with the river, and where there are good views of bird and wildlife foraging grounds. Observation decks and trails should be located such that there is minimal disruption of wildlife behavior. They should also be located such that there are minimal conflicts with hunting and minimal interference from the noise generated by motor boating and jet skiing.

#### 7.2.7.1 Estimated Costs for Multi-use Trail Installation

The estimated cost of developing multi-use trails is \$20 to \$40 per linear foot for a 10-foot-wide trail with 2-foot-wide shoulders on both sides. This estimate includes a gravel base, paving, and striping. However, costs can vary widely depending on substrate, grading requirements, permitting, and other factors.

#### 7.2.8 Picnic Facilities

Picnicking is one of the most popular recreation activities in the study area and region, having greatly increased in popularity over the past two decades. People of all ages and abilities can participate in this activity while enjoying the outdoors. As the population in the area increases, demands for additional picnic facilities are also expected to increase.

Facilities for picnicking can vary widely from simple benches located where one can enjoy the scenery, to individual picnic tables located in the shade of trees, to large covered structures with many tables and benches for larger groups. They may or may not include barbecues, drinking fountains and restrooms, but they should always include trash receptacles located in the vicinity of the tables. The popularity of different types of picnic facilities and other amenities vary by ethnic group. It is important to note that the large and growing Hispanic population in the study area tends to favor large picnic facilities that can accommodate large family group events and that include playground amenities and sufficient parking.

Picnic facilities are available at most river access locations within the northern portion of the study area. Within the southern portions of the study area, however, picnic facilities are absent for approximately 50 miles between Bidwell-Sacramento River State Park and Colusa, with the exception of facilities located at Ord Bend.

Recommendations for improving picnicking opportunities in the study area include:

**7.2.8 – A. Consider provision of limited picnic facilities at public access points.**

Consider providing some limited picnic facilities, such as tables and trash receptacles, wherever public access and parking areas can be made available.

**7.2.8 – B. Consider new picnic facilities sites.** Consider the desirability and sensibility of locations for picnic facilities. For instance, picnic facilities may be popular if they can be located near the river and gravel beaches, especially in stable channel locations, or along the edge of a mature riparian forest, close to towns and roads. Just as with camping facilities, restrictions on the types of facilities that can be developed in the flood zone, as well as maintenance costs, will likely limit the type and location of picnic facilities and associated parking lots (i.e., dirt versus paved) or restrooms (i.e., portable toilet versus building) in the study area.

### 7.2.9 Developed River Parks

Based on the 1997 DPR statewide study, highly developed parks and recreation areas near park visitors' homes ranked second highest in terms of use, with over 70% of statewide respondents indicating that they visit these types of parks several times per year or more frequently. There is an increasing need for more picnic facilities, other amenities, and camping facilities within the study area, however, locations for developing these facilities may be limited because of conservation goals, landowner concerns, lack of available land, and unstable riverbank conditions. A solution may be to develop multi-use facilities that can efficiently accommodate many complementary recreation uses in one location. Recommendations for developed river parks in the study area include:

**7.2.9 – A. Consider new multi-use river parks.** Consideration by counties and DPR to acquire land and develop river park facilities as part of their Parks & Recreation Master Plans and/or General Plans to meet the recreation needs for future populations. Generally, local governments are better suited to providing more intensively used amenities such as group picnic facilities, turfed play areas, play equipment, restroom facilities, and walkways or paths than agencies who do not consider these types of facilities as part of their mission. Lands owned and operated by DPR are developed nearly to the extent possible with respect to these types of facilities. The expanding area of public land near the Bidwell–Sacramento State Park, however, may offer opportunities for DPR to develop additional park facilities.

**7.2.9 – B. Determine best locations for multi-use parks.** Locations to be considered for multi-purpose parks should be located where demand is highest (near population centers) and where the riverbank is stable and protected (e.g., by existing hard points), and where natural amenities exist (e.g., gravel beaches). The parks could include picnic facilities, camping areas, nature trail, fish cleaning facilities, restrooms, playground structure, and ball fields. Large facilities with ball fields and other large group-oriented amenities would likely need to be located away from sensitive habitat areas. A boat rental facility could also be established as part of the park and could be run by either the county or a private concession.

## 7.3 Focus Site Recommendations

This section includes recommendations for the five focus sites of this study including the Gunhill Tract, Rx Ranch, Capay Unit, Dead Man's Reach, and the Ward Tract. The Gunhill Tract, Rx Ranch, and Capay Unit are discussed as part of a recommendation for establishment of a Pine Creek Preserve. Dead Man's Reach and Ward Tract are discussed in separate sections that follow.

### 7.3.1 Gunhill Tract, Rx Ranch and Capay Unit

The Gunhill Tract, Rx Ranch, and the Capay Unit all have limited recreation potential as individual sites. A much greater potential exists, however, if plans for these properties are developed in conjunction with the other public and private properties in the immediate vicinity of those properties. A plan for a much larger natural area offering compatible conservation and recreation opportunities is provided in recommendations 7.3.1 – A through 7.3.1 – C, which follow.

**7.3.1 - A. Establish Pine Creek Preserve.** The collection of public conservation land in the Pine Creek/Hamilton City area offers a unique opportunity to create a “Pine Creek Preserve” (this is a descriptive title for the purposes of this Study and the ultimate name for the Area should reflect the objectives of both conservation and recreation). The lands that would comprise this area include the Gunhill Tract and Rx Ranch; the Capay, Pine Creek and Phelan Island units of SRNWR; Brattan, Kaplan, and Vereschagen properties; Sunset and Harley Ranch; the Pine Creek Unit of SRWA; Bidwell-Sacramento River State Park; and Reclamation Board sites #36F(Glenn), 102F(Butte) and 30F (Exhibit 7-1). Together they form a nearly contiguous dynamic river system complex of over 3,800 acres of exceptional riparian forest, scrub, grassland, and riverine wetland habitats, along with lands undergoing restoration.

Creation of a Pine Creek Preserve would involve the resource agencies, private land trusts, community groups, schools, and universities. A master plan for the Preserve should be developed to coordinate the plans of the various public agencies and private entities and establish a shared vision for the area. The Pine Creek Preserve would offer a unique opportunity for developing a nature/visitor center in the local area that could provide educational, outreach, and research opportunities covering the importance and functions of California’s unique Sacramento River system. Designation of the Pine Creek Preserve offers the public agencies a unique opportunity to jointly achieve goals they hold in common and coordinate to provide the public with opportunities consistent with each of their missions. It also enables the chance to provide unique educational and research opportunities in the area. The proximity of California State University at Chico and the University of California at Davis enhances the value of a research center at this location and the likelihood of obtaining grant funding. Following are recommendations for potential facilities that may be considered as part of a Pine Creek Preserve.

**7.3.1 - B. Establish Nature/Visitor Center for Education, Interpretation and Outreach.** A multi-agency, nature/visitor center facility in the Pine Creek area would offer the opportunity for USFWS, DFG, and DPR to join together to provide visitors with

environmental and cultural history education, and public outreach focusing on the Sacramento River system and the region. A potential location for a nature/visitor center include:

- in the Hamilton City area, on the east side of the Sacramento River where a new setback levee is proposed, or
- at the Sunset Ranch along Highway 32 on the east side of the Sacramento River adjacent to the bridge.

Exhibits could give visitors a better understanding of the Central Valley include the geologic history of the area, natural and cultural conditions prior to settlement, historic and present day farming, conservation and ecological restoration, water projects and flood control, recreation use of the region, and future trends and needs. The nature center could include a developed nature trail that uses state-of-the art technology to “speak” to visitors on self-guided tours. The center could also offer special guided interpretive tours to normally off-limit areas. Such a trail could connect to a possible trail along the proposed setback levee near Hamilton City (See Section 7.2.7). The development and operation of this center could actively involve the community and schools of nearby Hamilton City.

**7.3.1 – C. Establish Research Center for the Study of the Ecology and Restoration of a Dynamic River System.** The addition of a dynamic river research center should also be considered within the Pine Creek Conservation Area. This center would provide a unique opportunity for research and increased knowledge with applications to other large dynamic river systems. It could also include a library that serves as a repository for information related to the entire Sacramento River Conservation Area. The research center might include an “environmental community camp” component that would offer students and researchers an onsite residence while performing their work and studies. The facility might be located adjacent to the proposed nature center. An alternate, separate location to consider may be on the west side of the river near the southern part of the Vereschagin property, depending on the location of any future setback levee. This area could also include a simple trail system that would not be as improved as that at the nature center, but would enable access for research areas.

#### **7.3.1.1 Estimated Visitor and Research Center Costs**

The costs for developing a nature/visitor center or research center range from an estimate of \$500,000 for an array of portable buildings to \$5,000,000 or more for a constructed-in-place facility on a reinforced mound above the 100-year flood elevation.

**Exhibit 7-1 (11x17)**

**Exhibit 7-1 (11x17 – 2<sup>nd</sup> page)**

### 7.3.2 Dead Man's Reach

Dead Man's Reach has been transferred to the USFWS for incorporation into the SRNWR. Following restoration of this site, a substantial amount of riparian woodland and scrub habitat will be added to the 67 acres of mixed riparian forest. The result will be an increased potential for public recreation opportunities compatible with wildlife conservation and the goals of the Refuge. The area has no public road access and therefore recreation potential is limited to that which can exist with river access only. The following is a recommendation for amenities to consider at the Dead Man's Reach site:

#### **7.3.2 – A. Consider fishing, nature observation, and education amenities.**

Amenities which may be compatible with the USFWS goals for this site and the access limitations of the Dead Man's Reach site include:

- fishing,
- hunting,
- photography
- wildlife observation, and
- interpretation and environmental education.

Uses for this and other SRNWR sites will be decided following completion of the CCP for the Refuge, anticipated in the spring of 2003.

### 7.3.3 Ward Tract

DPR has expressed interest in acquiring the Ward Tract, under ownership of TNC, to expand the Colusa-Sacramento River State Recreation Area and provide additional opportunities. Improvements could be made to enhance public recreation access in the Colusa area, yet remain consistent with plans for habitat restoration and conservation that were part of the CALFED funding agreement for this site. The following are recommendations for facilities and amenities to consider at Ward Tract:

**7.3.3 – A. Consider establishment of small nature interpretive center.** A small-scale interpretive center should be considered for the site (Exhibit 7-2). Such a center could provide opportunities for project-oriented outdoor education and environmental stewardship to small groups of students.

#### **7.3.3 – B. Consider fishing, nature observation, and education amenities.**

Amenities which may be compatible with the conservation goals for the Ward Tract include:

- trails, especially for beach access and nature interpretation,
- limited, primitive camping areas,
- fishing,
- hiking,
- photography,
- wildlife observation, and
- nature interpretation and environmental education.

If the Ward Tract is transferred to DPR, the department will conduct a master planning process to determine appropriate uses and improvements.

## **7.4 General Recommendations for Programs**

This section contains recommendations for the development of new or enhanced programs to aid in the facilitation of recreational access as determined through this study. These fall into the following categories:

- Public Information Coordination and Public Outreach and Planning
- Management Coordination Recommendations and Conclusions
- Law Enforcement Support Recommendations

All three coordination programs are considered high priority based on the expressed need for these programs by managers and law enforcement personnel, and the high level of interest in working together to improve efficiency and effectiveness in the areas of public access, public safety, outreach, monitoring, facilities maintenance, permitting, and other needs.

### **7.4.1 Public Information Coordination and Public Outreach and Planning**

Because of its role in the area that includes participation of landowners, political representatives, agency representatives and various other stakeholder groups, it is recommended that the Forum take the lead role in the implementation of the following recommendations. Many of these recommendations should be conducted in coordination with a proposed management coordination committee (Section 7.4.2). If any of the proposed activities are determined not to be within the capacity or purview of the Forum, these activities should be coordinated by the proposed management coordination committee. It is proposed that the Forum:

Exhibit 7-2 (11x17)

Exhibit 7-2 (11x17 – 2<sup>nd</sup> page)

**7.4.1 – A. Coordinate funding for public information and outreach program.** The Forum should develop public and/or private grant requests for funding the public information and outreach program.

**7.4.1 – B. Establish clearinghouse for information.** The Forum should consider serving as a clearinghouse for information about the river corridor, to provide a consistent source and quality of information that would be available to the public and agencies alike.

**7.4.1 – C. Establish and monitor river signage program.** The Forum should initiate and monitor a comprehensive signage program in coordination with the Department of Boating and Waterways, as discussed in Section 7.2.3 (Signage, Kiosks, and Outreach).

**7.4.1 – D. Develop map and access guide.** The Forum should coordinate development and distribution of a comprehensive map and access guide, in coordination with the Department of Boating and Waterways, showing both public and private access sites and available amenities (see Section 7.2.3). A guidebook should include photographs of access points, amenities, use opportunities available at each location, natural history of the region, and points of interest and historical significance.

**7.4.1 – E. Design and maintain public access website.** Forum should coordinate the development and maintenance of a central website that would include the same information from the comprehensive map or access guide.

**7.4.1 – F. Facilitate public outreach.** Forum should facilitate public outreach, dialogue and education regarding public access and recreation planning, property owner concerns, and legal agreements regarding public access.

## **7.4.2 Management Coordination Recommendations and Conclusions**

Recommendations for the management coordination program were determined based on an analysis of the opportunities and constraints managers described, as well as their direct responses for enhancing coordination among land management agencies, as provided in Chapter 5. Coordination recommendations can be grouped into two categories: management coordination approaches, and recommended subjects for coordination.

### **7.4.2.1 Management Coordination Approaches**

The missions and mandates of the various private, local, state, and federal landowner groups and agencies having land with public access opportunities vary. However, there is often considerable overlap in terms of goals such as resource protection. Overlap also occurs through common objectives and concerns in a dynamic river environment, such as maintenance and permitting needs. For effective coordination among the managers of these groups to

maximize the ability to share resources and services, it is essential that managers plan together across agency and organizational boundaries. The following recommendation is made to meet the expressed need for a formalized management coordination process:

**7.4.2.1 – A. Establish a management coordination committee.** The formation of a formalized management coordination committee is recommended. The management coordination committee should include public agencies and private entities responsible for the management of conservation and recreation properties along the river corridor, including federal, state, county, and private nonprofit and private forprofit entities.

This committee should hold regular meetings to identify and facilitate opportunities for mutual support, sharing of information and improvements to both ecosystem and recreation objectives.

**7.4.2.1 – B. Continue informal coordination.** In addition to formal coordination, informal management coordination should continue to develop. Informal coordination should continue in the form of day-to-day meetings on land management, and increased opportunities to develop good working relationships.

#### **7.4.2.2 Recommended Subjects for Coordination**

The following are recommended subject areas for management committee coordination:

**7.4.2.2 – A. Develop contacts web page.** Develop a contacts database and/or web page with the Forum to provide contact information for questions or concerns regarding primary points of contact for different agencies or stakeholders, including expertise and resources available.

**7.4.2.2 – B. Create information clearinghouse and GIS database.** Create an information clearinghouse and shared GIS database with Forum, for accurate information regarding land ownership, acquisitions, conservation easements, land availability; public access, facilities management, and trail planning; species and habitat distribution; invasive species infestations; and other information. A shared GIS database could be developed using standard datums so that agencies could share and merge data files and use them for management assistance.

**7.4.2.2 – C. Coordinate permits.** Coordinate on special event permits, permits for sanitary facilities within the floodplain, and umbrella permits to cover boat ramp maintenance, dredging, habitat enhancement and invasive species abatement, and other regular and widespread management activities.

**7.4.2.2 – D. Share resources and expertise.** Cooperate and share resources and expertise among facilities management and local governments regarding maintenance or other needs.

**7.4.2.2 – E. Develop additional cooperative agreements.** Increase coordination in the form of MOUs, interagency agreements, cooperative agreements among agencies and counties, and lease agreements. Draw locally on available expertise and equipment in an efficient manner for operating and maintaining facilities (e.g., boat ramps), and for management of mitigation properties and borrow pit sites.

**7.4.2.2 – F. Transfer property for effective management.** Conservation and recreation properties can be most effectively managed as part of a complex of similar properties in close proximity; therefore, transfers of property or management authority between governmental agencies may be desirable. The Bureau of Land Management has discussed transferring Todd Island and Foster Island properties to the USFWS because BLM's management focus is in the area north of Red Bluff. This transfer should be revisited following completion of the CCD for SRNWR. Another transfer that should be evaluated involves the 13 Reclamation Board properties in the study area. Because the Reclamation Board's mission does not include habitat management, the agency has no programs related to recreation uses. Transfer of these various properties to either DFG or USFWS may offer the best option for both habitat preservation and recreation.

**7.4.2.2 – G. Coordinate funding opportunities.** Coordinate to enable the creation of shared visitor facilities, such as a kiosk, visitor center, nature center, and/or research center. Agencies should also consider cooperating on grant applications such as to the Department of Boating and Waterways to fund educational programs, facilities, and other boating-related needs.

**7.4.2.2 – H. Coordinate on signage, outreach and educational material.** In coordination with Forum, develop and coordinate implementation of a comprehensive river and road signage program, guidebooks, maps, brochures, and website(s) indicating locally available public access opportunities, facilities and services.

**7.4.2.2 – I. Coordinate on public access and use planning.** Coordinate on the planning and management of public access facilities and amenities, such as "boating trails", hiking trails, and other recreation facilities and amenities. The type and location of public facilities will need to be based on the missions and goals of the landowners, including resource protection goals, as well as public interest and concerns. During the public access planning process, public involvement should be encouraged, including the involvement of landowners, community members, local government and interest groups.

**7.4.2.2 – J. Initiate research on fluvial geomorphology.** Initiate a cooperative study of the area’s fluvial geomorphology with the Forum, with an objective of improving the design and placement of boat ramps and board points, and to minimize maintenance requirements.

**7.4.2.2 – K. Plan for special events.** Increase cooperation for special events, such as tubing events, including permits and one-time easements to provide limited, controlled access, and coordination with law enforcement personnel.

**7.4.2.2 – L. Coordinate with law enforcement.** Increase understanding of who to coordinate with, and facilitate understanding of jurisdictional responsibilities; discuss increasing law enforcement, including river patrols; share resources and expertise; hold training sessions; and know what agency or personnel to contact for regular coordination meetings or efforts. Hold an annual meeting with managers and law enforcement representatives of resource agencies, county sheriff departments, and other local law enforcement entities.

**7.4.2.2 – M. Establish monitoring program.** Establish a monitoring program together with law enforcement managers, to document public use levels and determine triggers for management actions related to biological, physical, and social impacts associated with recreation use of the study areas.

### **7.4.3 Law Enforcement Support Recommendations**

The Sacramento River Conservation Area Forum, coordinated management group, local government and other agencies with interests in the management of the Sacramento River should jointly seek additional resources for enhancing law enforcement along the river.

Based on the law enforcement needs analysis provided in Chapter 6 of this study, several recommendations can be made. Described below are recommendations to improve communications about watercraft use of the river, build on current interagency coordination networks, increase participation of law enforcement entities in coordinated management between agencies, and seek additional resources to support increasingly over-taxed law enforcement structures.

**7.4.3 – A. Seek Additional and Alternative Funding.** The group should attempt to identify alternative funding sources that can supplement local government and agency resources to help better serve the river corridor. Coordination between the legislative bodies of local governments and agency managers will be required to lobby for such funding.

**7.4.3 – B. Install Signs to Manage Boat Traffic.** Public information relating to use of watercraft, particularly on the southern end of the river study section near Colusa should be increased. Hazards such as speed and etiquette, could be addressed in a public information campaign focused on boat launch sites, as well as provision of sign buoys on the river.

**7.4.3 – C. Enhance United Command Efforts.** There already is highly developed coordination of law enforcement during the large-scale tubing events during the summer peak season. This structure should be maintained and built upon as part of any future policing efforts in the area. More resources are needed to manage these large events, which pose significant public safety and resource protection challenges.

**7.4.3 – D. Include Law Enforcement as part of Coordinated Management Program.** Local, state, and federal law enforcement personnel should be a sub-component of the larger coordinated management efforts discussed in Chapter 5 of this report. The time requirement for participation in semi-annual coordination meetings is estimated to be approximately 2.5 to 3 staff days from each participating agency.

**7.4.3 – E. Plan Increases in Law Enforcement Support.** Findings from this report indicate that increases in law enforcement support will be required for adequate public safety. The effect of increased pressures on the area from increased public recreation use will undoubtedly be felt by all agencies responsible for law enforcement and public safety. Interviews with law enforcement officers yielded general figures for the cost of increased law enforcement, and were specifically described by two participants. Specific estimated costs were indicated as follows:

- \$110,000 initially for the addition of one public safety officer and equipment for one unit, with an annual cost of \$60,000. This includes at least one jet boat (\$50,000) with an annual operations and maintenance cost of \$10,000, and an additional salaried position (jet boat patrol officer) costing approximately \$50,000 annually; and
- An initial cost of \$100,000 for one additional full-time officer, and a patrol truck and boat.

Based on these limited estimates, increase costs are estimated to be \$130,000 initially per unit for one additional public safety officer and one additional truck or boat, and an increased annual cost of \$80,000 for salary and equipment maintenance. Assuming an increase of 4 to 7 persons (one per law enforcement unit) over the next 5–10 years, the increased cost for law enforcement within the study area is estimated to be between \$100,000 per year initially and \$700,000 per year, after 10 years.

## 7.5 Permits and Regulatory Requirements

Permits that potentially apply to activities related to the public recreation access facilities construction, operations or maintenance are listed in the table below. This table is intended as a guide; however, different levels, locations and intensities of activity may require additional levels of compliance for each agency.

Table 7-1 describes the permits and regulatory requirements as they apply to specific activities within the study area. NEPA applies whenever a federal agency proposes an action, grants a permit, or agrees to fund or otherwise authorize any other entity to undertake an action that could affect environmental resources. CEQA applies to all discretionary activities proposed to be carried out or approved by California public agencies, including state, regional, county, and local agencies. Certain categories of projects are exempt from these statutes, but these projects must be individually reviewed to see if exemptions apply. Explanation of the permits and regulations listed in Table 7-1 (including agencies responsible for their administration) and potentially applicable to proposed recreation facilities development and on-going maintenance activities in the study area are provided in Appendix B.

Not all permits and regulatory requirements apply to certain activities in every situation. The location of the proposed activity in relation to the resources will determine which regulations and permits apply. For example, if the activity is located below the OHWM of a “Water of the U.S.” (e.g., Sacramento River) and will involve fill, then U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) requirements would apply. To place fill or to dredge below the OHWM, the activity must be covered by one of the Nationwide permits (see Appendix B) or an individual permit must be obtained from the USACE. If the activity is not affecting a wetland or Water of the U.S., then a USACE permit would not be required.

In addition to these requirements, public access facilities undergoing renovation, as well as new facilities, all must comply with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) and Title 24 the California Code of Regulations (Access Code) requirements that require newly constructed or remodeling projects in buildings and facilities to be made accessible for people with disabilities

**Table 7-1. Applicable Regulations/Permits by Proposed Activity**

Potential Project/Activity	401 Certification	Streambed Alteration Agreement (DFG)	Section 10 (USACE) Letter of Permission	Section 404 <sup>1</sup> (USACE)	Local Permits <sup>2</sup> (e.g. grading and building permits)	California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)	National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)	Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) and California Endangered Species Act (CESA)	Section 106	Reclamation Board Encroachment Permit	Notes
Construct Boat Ramp	Y	Y	Y	NWP 36	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Under NWP 36, boat ramps cannot 20 feet in length and cannot result in more than 50 cubic yards of discharge.
Construct New Marina	Y	Y	Y	Individual Permit	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Construct Visitor Center/Other Building Facilities	M	M	M	NWP 42 (if discharging material into a wetland or water of the U.S.)	Y	Y	M	M	M	M	If buildings are proposed within the OHWM, bed or bank of the river, other permit requirements would apply.
Construction of Trails	M	M	M	NWP 42	M	M	M	M	M	N	In some cases, new trails may be exempt from NEPA and CEQA.
Construct New Access Roads	M	M	N	M	Y	Y	M	M	M	M	Under Section 404, this activity may require an individual permit if the activity will result in discharge of material to "waters of the U.S."
Dredging/Siltation Removal	Y	Y	N	NWP 19	Y	Y	Y	M	Y	M	
Fueling Station (for boats)	M	M	M	May require an individual permit	Y	Y	M	M	M	Y	Required permits will depend on location and permanence of facility.
New Primitive Campgrounds	M	M	M	NWP 42	M	M	M	M	M	M	In some cases, new primitive campgrounds may be exempt from NEPA and CEQA.
New Developed Campgrounds	M	M	M	NWP 42	Y	Y	M	M	M	M	RV parks are not covered under NWP 42, so an individual permit may be needed.
Picnic Sites (and associated parking)	M	M	N	NWP 42	Y	Y	M	M	M	M	
Y = Permits would be required in these instances. M = Permits may be required depending on resources affected. N = Permits not required or not applicable for a particular activity.											

<sup>1</sup> Section 404 only applies if the activity includes fill or discharge to wetlands or other waters of the U.S. If any activities do not meet Nationwide permit requirements, an individual permit may be required.

<sup>2</sup> Local permits may include, but are not limited to, provisions in the general plan, local tree ordinances, grading permits, building permits, and encroachment permits.

Source: EDAW 2003

## **7.6 Further Evaluate the Potential for New Recreation Opportunities for the Region**

The Forum, resource agencies, and other entities active in the area should continue to identify and evaluate other public recreation access opportunities for the region and evaluate their compatibility with the local resources and communities, the interest level and potential impacts. This might include a survey of recreation uses, activities, programs, issues and solutions in other regions with similar large alluvial river systems.

### **7.6.1 Considerations for Future Recreation Studies: Limitations Imposed by Available Data**

Estimates of the number of study area residents and the number of people overall who engage in specific types of outdoor recreation would be best constructed from adequate visitation data for recreation sites within the study river corridor. In the absence of such data, making estimates would require knowledge about the proportion of users that are from outside the study area and from outside the state. This type of information should be collected if future studies that attempt to measure recreation demand or estimate future recreation trends are conducted in the area.

Estimating the supply of specific recreation activities would require data beyond that available on land and water acreage and facilities associated with various providers. Necessary data would include counts of current recreation visitors throughout the year, as well as estimates of the capacity of these land and water areas and facilities to support various recreation activities. These capacities may change temporally over seasons, such as when resource conditions and wildlife migration patterns shift and impose limitations on public use. Competition between various recreation users should also be studied, which would assemble information on the use patterns of different user groups who seek to use the same resources (e.g., hunters and bird watchers).

## **7.7 Conclusions**

The Sacramento River between Red Bluff and Colusa continues to be a popular and likely under-used recreation destination within the northern California region. Because the 1980s, the Sacramento River from Red Bluff to Colusa has become more attractive to people as a natural area because of efforts increasing the amount of natural habitat in the area. Greater acreage devoted to increasing populations of plant, animal, and aquatic life will likely draw more people to the area because Californians indicate that the qualities of naturalness are highly attractive as recreation settings. As the region's population grows, demand for public recreation opportunities will increase greatly, especially for activities such as nature observation, hiking,

and picnicking. This is consistent for people's large and growing interest in natural areas to satisfy their recreation needs.

There is a gap between the public demand and the availability for public recreation access facilities in the area, including boat ramps, trails, and other facilities. There is also a great need for public outreach to understand public agency goals in the region as well as basic knowledge of where are public access points along the river. Increased management coordination and law enforcement coordination will be needed to meet needs and handle issues such as boat ramp closures and annual tubing events, as well as to plan for the anticipated increase in public use of the river. Coordination between the recreation use providers within the region should also include input from landowners, recreation users, and other stakeholders in the region. Integration of social information from all involved in the health of the river will be critically important to support and plan for improvements to existing and future recreational use along the Sacramento River.

Managers have indicated that the study comes at an important time and it has opened doors to additional thinking, and to coordinate with one another. The benefits from increased coordination among land managers should be more effective regional planning for the economic and social benefit of the community and preservation of functionality and resources associated with a large, dynamic Sacramento River system. Increased coordination should enable more efficient use of funding and available expertise and resources, better outreach to the public, and more opportunities for improvements and programs in the region such signage along the river, improved boat ramp designs, and a possible regional visitor center.

Recreation planning along the Sacramento River needs to strike a balance between recreation use, other human uses, and programs for the protection and restoration of the dynamic Sacramento River system. In achieving that balance, the community, recreation users, and the river, will all flourish.