Comprehensive Plan Consistency Evaluation
Interim Report

DRAFT

Oroville Facilities P-2100 Relicensing

DRAFT for LUWG Review and Comment

prepared by

The HARZA EDAW Team

January 31, 2003

CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND 1-1
1.1 Purpose 1-1
1.2 Background for Study SP-L3; Comprehensive Plan Consistency 1-1

2.0 STUDY OBJECTIVES 2-1

3.0 STUDY METHODS 3-1

4.0 SUMMARY OF RELEVANT COMPREHENSIVE AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS 4-1
4.1 Federal Plans 4-1
4.1.1 United States Forest Service, *Plumas National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan*, 1988 4-1
4.1.2 United States Forest Service, *Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment*, 2000 4-5
4.1.3 Bureau of Land Management, *Redding Resource Management Plan*, 1993 4-5
4.2 State Plans 4-6
4.2.1 Department of Parks and Recreation, *California Outdoor Recreation Plan*, 1993 (published 1994) 4-6
4.2.2 Department of Parks and Recreation, *Public Opinions and Attitudes on Outdoor Recreation in California*, 1997 4-8
4.2.3 Department of Parks and Recreation, *Recreation Needs in California*, 1983 4-9
4.2.4 Department of Parks and Recreation, *Lake Oroville State Recreation Area Resource Management Plan and General Development Plan*, 1973 4-9
4.2.5 Department of Water Resources, *Proposed Amended Recreation Plan for Lake Oroville State Recreation Area*, 1993 4-9
4.2.6 Department of Water Resources, *The California Water Plan Update*, 1994. (Based on DWR, California Water Plan Update: Bulletin 160-98, 1998) 4-10
4.2.7 Department of Water Resources, *Lake Oroville Fisheries Habitat Improvement Plan*, 1995 4-11
4.2.8 Department of Fish and Game, *Oroville Wildlife Area Management Plan*, 1978 4-11
4.2.9 Department of Fish and Game, *California Regulations on Hunting and Other Public Uses on State and Federal Areas*, 2002 4-12
4.2.10 California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and State Board of Forestry, The California Fire Plan, 1999 4-12
4.2.11 California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and State Board of Forestry, *California Fire Plan: A Framework for Minimizing Costs and Losses From Wildland Fire*, 1996 4-12

CONTENTS
(continued)

4.2.12 California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection Butte Unit, *Fire Management Plan*, 2002 4-13
4.3 Local Plans 4-14
4.3.1 Regional Plans 4-15
4.3.2 County Plans 4-16
4.3.3 Municipal Plans 4-18
4.4 Previously Considered Documents to Reevaluate 4-20

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4-1 Relevant Comprehensive Land Use and Resource Management Plans in the Oroville Project Area 4-2
Table 4-2 Applicable Plumas National Forest Standards and Guidelines in the Galen Management Area 4-3
Table 4-3 Applicable Plumas National Forest Standards and Guidelines in the French Creek Management Area 4-4
Table 4-4 Applicable Plumas National Forest Standards and Guidelines in the Kellogg Management Area 4-4
Table 4-5 Butte County General Plan Policies Related to Lake Oroville 4-18
Table 4-6 City of Oroville General Plan Policies that Mention the Project 4-20

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
ARP	Amended Recreation Plan
ALP	Alternative Licensing Procedure
BCAG	Butte County Association of Governments
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
CDF	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
DFG	Department of Fish and Game
DPR	Department of Parks and Recreation
DWR	Department of Water Resources
FERC	Federal Energy Regulatory Commission
LOSRA	Lake Oroville State Recreation Area
LRMP	Land and Resource Management Plan
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
OWA	Oroville Wildlife Area
PME	Protection, mitigation, and enhancement
PWA	Pre-Fire Workload Analyzer
R&PP	Recreation and Public Purpose Act
RAMS	Resource Area Manager
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
RTPA	Regional Transportation Planning Agency
SBF	State Board of Forestry
SP-L3	Comprehensive Plan Consistency Evaluation
SVRA	State Vehicle Recreation Area
TEA	Transportation Equity Act
USFS	U.S. Forest Service

1.0 INTRODUCTION/BACKGROUND

1.1 PURPOSE

The purpose of this Interim Report is to depict the progress that has been made to date for SP-L3 (Comprehensive Plan Consistency Evaluation). SP-L3 identifies and determines the consistency, or inconsistency, of potential change to the facilities and operations of the Lake Oroville Hydroelectric Project (the Project) as a result of relicensing with relevant land use and resource management plans. The Project is managed by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) for the purposes of water supply, flood control, hydropower generation, and public recreation use. The Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) license for the Project expires in February 2007. The relicensing process was initiated in June 2000, and the first public meeting for this Project was held in Oroville in the same month. This Interim Report has been developed in support of the Project, licensed by the FERC (FERC Project # 2100).

DWR decided to use an Alternative Licensing Procedure (ALP) that involves a collaborative planning effort with local entities, state and federal agencies with mandatory conditioning authority, Native American tribes, and local and regional recreation interests. This collaborative process was initiated in December 2000. Work groups representing major resource categories (e.g., Environmental, Engineering and Operations) are assisting DWR decision-making regarding relicensing issues, the scope of resource studies, and ultimately protection, mitigation and enhancement (PME) measures. The Land Use, Land Management, and Aesthetics Work Group is assisting DWR with regard to land use and aesthetics studies.

The Interim Report for Comprehensive Plan Consistency Evaluation provides a status update of the review of relevant comprehensive land and natural resource management plans. This study was approved in July of 2002. The Final Comprehensive Plan Consistency Report will be submitted in April 2003.

This Interim Report is organized in the following manner:

- Section 1 provides the background information for why the study was required;
- Section 2 describes study objectives;
- Section 3 describes study methods; and
- Section 4 contains an evaluation of plans.

In this Interim Report, comprehensive land use and resource management plans are reviewed and summarized. A more in-depth consistency analysis will be conducted as part of the Final Comprehensive Plan Consistency Evaluation Report (Final Report). The Final Report will assess whether potential changes to Project facilities and operations are consistent or inconsistent with relevant comprehensive land and natural resource management plans.

1.2 BACKGROUND FOR STUDY SP-L3; COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CONSISTENCY

FERC regulations require: (a) the identification of all relevant comprehensive land use and resource management plans, and (b) a discussion of the consistency or lack of consistency with each plan as a result of potential changes to Project facilities and operations as a result of

relicensing. FERC also requires an applicant justify a lack of consistency and document communication with agencies that have land use and resource management authority in the area. SP-L3 involves reviewing relevant comprehensive land use and resource management plans to determine if changes to the Project as a result of relicensing efforts would be consistent or inconsistent with those plans. FERC has issued a list of relevant comprehensive plans for each state which are identified in Table 4-1. Appropriate plans identified by FERC are included in this Interim Report, as are plans that are not on the FERC list, but that are relevant to the Project.

2.0 STUDY OBJECTIVES

The overall objective of SP-L3 is to identify relevant comprehensive land use and resource management plans and to determine the consistency, or lack of consistency, of potential changes to Project facilities and operations as a result of relicensing with those plans. This information will help determine how potential changes to Project facilities and operations will or will not conform to the management direction of relevant comprehensive land use and resource management plans.

3.0 STUDY METHODS

FERC identified comprehensive plans for the State of California that were relevant to the Project for review. Other relevant comprehensive and resource management plans that were known to staff or identified by the Land Use and Aesthetics Work Group were also obtained and reviewed. In addition, Resource Area Managers (RAMS) from other work groups were contacted to identify other relevant comprehensive or resource management plans and asked to provide descriptions of the plans.

For this Interim Report, plans were reviewed and summarized.

4.0 SUMMARY OF RELEVANT COMPREHENSIVE AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANS

The following is a summary of relevant comprehensive land use and resource management plans. Table 4-1 lists the plans that have been (or will be) reviewed for SP-L3. This section of the Interim Report is organized by jurisdiction, beginning with federal plans, continuing to state plans, and then local plans.

[Note to Jim Martin and LUWG: We will want the technical leads and other appropriate people to review our summaries of "their" comprehensive plans that are contained in this section. We will also want them to identify key components of the plans that may be affected by changes to Project facilities and operations as a result of relicensing]

4.1 FEDERAL PLANS

The federal government does not have extensive land holdings in the Project area. Federal lands that are in the Project area are managed by the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). USFS lands are part of the Plumas and Lassen National Forests and are managed under the *Plumas National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan)*. In addition, management of these lands is influenced by the more recent *Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment (Plan Amendment)*. BLM is responsible for scattered lands managed under the direction of the *Redding Resource Management Plan (RMP)*. All three plans are discussed below.

4.1.1 United States Forest Service, *Plumas National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, 1988*

The Forest Plan was adopted in 1988 and directs the management of the 1,618,517 acres of the Plumas National Forest and 15,000 acres of the Lassen National Forest. The Plumas National Forest includes lands adjacent to the Project in the North Fork, Middle Fork, and South Fork extremities of Lake Oroville. Lands in the Big Bend area are contained within Lassen National Forest but are managed by Plumas National Forest and fall under the management direction of the Plumas Forest Plan.

The purpose of the Forest Plan is to help guide the USFS in the efficient use and protection of Forest resources, fulfill legislative requirements and balance local, regional and national needs. The Forest Plan establishes the management goals and policies that direct the management of the Forest over 10 to 15 years (the "planning period") and helps meet long term objectives over a 50 year period (the "planning horizon"). The Forest Plan also prescribes management practices for specified areas and time periods needed to obtain these objectives. In general, the policies for the lands in the areas near the Project emphasize resource conservation, provision of high quality recreational opportunities, and protection of visual resources.

The Forest Plan has assigned Management Areas to all Forest lands, including lands near the Project. There are three Management Areas for Forest lands near the Project. Each Management Area has general guidelines for achieving resource objectives along with standards and guidelines for managing the various resources such as recreation, visual resources, wildlife, and lands. Lands within each Management Area have been assigned a Management Prescription.

Table 4-1. Relevant Comprehensive Land Use and Resource Management Plans in the Oroville Project Area.

Agency	Document Title	Date	FERC Identified Plan
FEDERAL			
USFS	Plumas National Forest Land and Resource and Management Plan	1988	No
USFS	Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment	2000	No
BLM	Redding Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision	1993	No
STATE			
DPR	California Outdoor Recreation Plan	1994	Yes
DPR	Public Opinions and Attitudes on Outdoor Recreation in California	1997	Yes
DPR	Recreation Needs in California	1983	Yes
DPR	Lake Oroville State Recreation Area Resource Management Plan and General Development Plan	1973	No
DWR	The California Water Plan Update	1994	Yes
DWR	Amended Recreation Plan for Lake Oroville State Recreation Area	1993	No
DWR	Lake Oroville Fisheries Habitat Improvement Plan	1995	No
DFG	Oroville Wildlife Management Area Management Plan	1978	No
DFG	California Regulations on Hunting and Other Public Uses on State and Federal Areas	2002	No
CDF	Fire Management Plan	2001	No
CDF & SBF	The California Fire Plan	1999	No
LOCAL			
City of Oroville	General Plan	1995	No
City of Oroville	Bicycle Transportation Plan	1998	No
Butte County	General Plan	1996	No
BCAG	Butte County Bicycle Plan, Butte County 2001 Regional Transportation Plan	2001	No
BCAG	Countywide Bikeway Master Plan	1998	No
DOCUMENTS TO REEVALUATE			
DWR	1999 Lake Oroville Annual Report of Fish Stocking and Fish Habitat Improvements	2000	No
DFG	Draft Plant List for the Oroville Wildlife Management Area	1995	No
Dept. of Finance	City/County Population and Housing Estimates	2000	No
DWR	Concerning the operation of the Oroville Division of the State Water Project for management of fish and wildlife	1983	No

Notes: DPR = Department of Parks and Recreation
DWR = Department of Water Resources
DFG = Department of Fish and Game
BLM = Bureau of Land Management
USFS = United States Forest Service
BCAG = Butte County Association of Governments
CDF = California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
SBF = State Board of Forestry

Each Management Prescription has a different management emphasis. Along with specific standards and guidelines, the Management Prescriptions also contain general guidelines for achieving resource objectives within the Management Area.

The three management areas adjacent to the Project area include the Galen, French Creek, and Kellogg Management Areas. These management areas, and their standards and policies as they relate to Lake Oroville, are described below.

- Galen Management Area – The Galen Management Area extends easterly from Big Bend on the North Fork to the canyon of the Middle Fork of the Feather River. This 8,719-acre management area is bounded on the north by a segment of the North Fork Feather River and the Oroville-Quincy Road through the Brush Creek Work Center and on the south by the Forest boundary. Instability is a problem in the steep North Fork Canyon. Dispersed recreation is light because the area lacks recreational attractions and private land is widespread. Major activities include fishing, hunting, and some camping. No developed campgrounds are in the area. Table 4-2 lists the standards and guidelines for the Galen Management Area, as applicable to the project.
- French Creek Management Area – The French Creek Management Area is located between the North Fork of the Feather River, the Pulga-Four Trees Road, and the Oroville-Quincy Road. This 29,892-acre management area is primarily within the watershed of French Creek, which flows into the North Fork of the Feather River within Lake Oroville. Table 4-3 lists the standards and guidelines for the French Creek Management Area, as applicable to the project.
- Kellogg Management Area – The Kellogg Management Area is a 1 to 2 mile wide corridor along the north side of the Middle Fork of the Feather River Canyon from Oroville Reservoir to near Bear Creek. Slightly less than half of this Management Area is within Butte County. Table 4-4 lists some of the standards and guidelines for the Kellogg Management Area.

Table 4-2. Applicable Plumas National Forest Standards and Guidelines in the Galen Management Area.

General Direction	Standards and Guidelines
Recreation	
Efficiently manage recreation in the Lake Oroville State Recreation	Continue cooperation allowing DPR to manage the reservoir area including Plumas National Forest lands.
Provide for semi-primitive recreation	Maintain the character of the Big Bald Rock semi-primitive area. Restrict ORV use.
Facilities	
Provide roads necessary to meet developed recreation and other demands	Improve access to the Milsap Bar Campground on the North Fork Feather River.

Source: USFS (1988)

Table 4-3. Applicable Plumas National Forest Standards and Guidelines in the French Creek Management Area.

General Direction	Standards and Guidelines
Recreation	
Efficiently manage recreation in the Lake Oroville State Recreation Area	Continue cooperation allowing the DPR to manage the reservoir area including Plumas National Forest lands.
Provide developed recreation facilities/programs to meet demand while reducing unit costs	Maintain Rogers Cow Camp Campground, but operate as a self-service facility with no developed water supply. Close when major expenditure is required.
Visual Resources	
Maintain pleasing visual corridors	Minimize the visual impact of transmission lines and hydroelectric facilities.
Wildlife	
Maintain species viability	Provide suitable bald eagle foraging habitat along the North Fork upstream from Lake Oroville.
Water	
Protect and where necessary, improve water quality	Maintain and construct additional erosion control works when needed to control excessive erosion and sedimentation from the French Creek basin.
Facilities	
Upgrade forest arterials and collectors	Reconstruct the Quincy-Oroville Highway as part of the Forest Highway System. Reconstruct the Stanwood Saddle Road in cooperation with Butte County.

Source: USFS (1988)

Table 4-4. Applicable Plumas National Forest Standards and Guidelines in the Kellogg Management Area.

General Direction	Standards and Guidelines
Recreation	
Protect and enhance recreation use of the Middle Fork of the Feather River	Manage Wildlife Scenic Zones consistent with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.
Provide for semi-primitive recreation	Maintain the semi-primitive character of the Middle Fork and Bald Rock in areas without roads.
Expand and improve the trail system	Nominate Hartman Bar Trail as a National Recreation Trail when right-of-way is secured; improve facilities to meet planned uses.
Wildlife	
Protect and improve emphasis species habitat	Coordinate projects affecting wild trout streams with DFG. Provide suitable peregrine falcon habitat in the Bald Rock Dome area.
Facilities	
Upgrade forest arterials and collectors	Improve the Milsap campground access road as use studies show need to meet demand.
Special Ares	
Protect unique scenic values	Continue special management of Feather Falls Scenic Area; recommend designation of Feather Falls as a National Natural Landmark.
Protect unique scenic and botanic values	Preserve the champion ponderosa pine adjacent to the Hartman Bar Trail.

Source: USFS (1988)

4.1.2 United States Forest Service, *Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment*, 2000

In December 2002, the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment (Plan Amendment) was adopted by all land and resource management plans (LRMPs) for National Forests in the Sierra Nevada and Modoc Plateau, including the two National Forests located near the Project-- the Plumas and Lassen National Forests. The Plan Amendment was adopted in response to the need for an old forest and associated species (such as the California spotted owl) conservation strategy that would protect, increase and perpetuate old forest conditions. The amendment specifically addressed several problem areas that are briefly described below:

- Protect, increase and perpetuate old forest ecosystems and provide for the viability of native plant and animal species associated with old forest ecosystems;
- Protect and restore aquatic, riparian, and meadow ecosystems and provide for the viability of native plant and animal species associated with these ecosystems;
- Manage fire and other fuels in a consistent manner across the national forests, coordinate management strategies with other land owners, integrate fire and fuels management objectives with other natural resource objectives, address the role of wildland fire, and set priorities for fire and fuels management actions;
- Reduce and where possible, reverse the spread of noxious weeds; and
- Maintain and enhance hardwood ecosystems in the lower west side of the Sierra Nevada.

The Plan Amendment includes management strategies and standards and guidelines to address the problem areas listed above. Some Forest Plan standards and guidelines were superceded by provisions in the Plan Amendment.

4.1.3 Bureau of Land Management, *Redding Resource Management Plan*, 1993

The primary purpose of the Redding Resource Management Plan (RMP) is to update and integrate BLM land use planning for the Redding Resource Area into a single, comprehensive land use plan. The RMP directs the management of public lands and Federal mineral estates that are administered by the BLM within the Redding Resource Area of north central California. The four main land use issues addressed in the RMP are land tenure adjustment, recreation management, access, and forest management.

The Redding Resource Area encompasses approximately 247,500 acres of public land and 142,000 acres of federal mineral estate within Butte, Shasta, Siskiyou, Tehama, and Trinity counties. The total amount of land that the Redding RMP covers is almost 10 million acres. The Redding Resource Area consists of more than a thousand individual parcels of public land, scattered through five counties in northern California. To adequately address management issues in such a large geographic area, the Resource Area was broken into seven smaller units termed "management areas," including: Scott Valley, Klamath, Trinity, Shasta, Sacramento River, Ishi, and Yolla Bolly. The Oroville Project is located in the Ishi Management Area.

The Ishi Management Area is broken down further into seven sub-areas which include: Battle Creek, Deer Creek, Forks of Butte Creek, Minnehaha Mine, Upper Ridge Nature Preserve, Baker Cypress, and the Remainder of the Management Area. The Oroville Project lands fall under the Remainder of the Management Area sub-area. Within each sub-area are numbered Resource

Condition Objectives which indicate how lands in the sub-areas are to be managed. The Resource Condition Objectives for the Remainder of the Management Area sub-area that apply to the Project are listed below (by number from the RMP).

(1) Enhancing the resource management efficiency and public service mission of local, state, and Federal agencies via transfer of specific public lands from BLM.

(2) Enhancing the ability to acquire high value resource lands within the Redding Resource Area by disposal of scattered public land interests within the Ishi Management Area.

(5) Transfer via the Recreation and Public Purpose Act (R&PP) or exchange to a qualified state/local agency or non-profit organization administrative responsibility of six parcels of public land encompassing approximately 800 acres in the West Branch Feather River (between Magalia Reservoir and Lake Oroville).

(7) Transfer via exchange or R&PP to the State of California all surface and submerged public lands, which encompasses approximately 6,400 acres within and adjacent to the Lake Oroville State Recreation Area. All lands identified by California or BLM as excess to park needs will be offered for exchange to any party after 2 years from approval of the Final RMP.

(8) 200 acres of public land near the Middle Fork Feather River are suitable for community development purposes as a reservation for federally recognized Indian tribe(s). If congressional support is unavailable, offer for exchange to any party after 5 years from the approval of the Final RMP.

4.2 STATE PLANS

The State of California owns and manages a significant amount of land in the Project area. Several agencies are responsible for the management of State land and have developed management plans for guidance. State agencies that have management responsibilities for State lands in the Project area include the Department of Water Resources (DWR), the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) and the Department of Fish and Game (DFG). In addition to these three State agencies, the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) has developed management plans that influence land and resource management activities in the Project area. The following section summarizes state agency plans and information that pertains to the Project area.

4.2.1 Department of Parks and Recreation, *California Outdoor Recreation Plan*, 1993 (published 1994)

The California DPR is responsible for the preparation and periodic revision of the comprehensive California Outdoor Recreation Plan (Outdoor Recreation Plan). The Outdoor Recreation Plan was designed to meet the specific program responsibilities of the federal Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, whose concerns are outdoor recreation, land acquisition, facility development, redevelopment and rehabilitation. The 1993 edition of the Outdoor

Recreation Plan provides a tool for statewide outdoor recreation leadership and action for the next 5 years. This plan provides policy guidance and basic information of value to all public agencies – state, federal, and local – engaged in providing outdoor recreational lands and facilities throughout the state. The Outdoor Recreation Plan describes existing conditions, explores and analyzes the resultant outdoor recreation issues that will be of major concern to public agencies in the next 5 years, and identifies a broad scope of recreation opportunities available in California. The seven most critical issues facing park and recreational agencies identified in the Outdoor Recreation Plan include:

(1) Improving resource stewardship

(2) Serving a changing population

(3) Responding to limited funding

(4) Building strong leadership

(5) Managing aging facilities

(6) Expanding legislative support and minimizing legal setbacks

(7) Improving recreation opportunities through planning and research

Chapter 1 of the Outdoor Recreation Plan consists of general State policy statements. The Project-related policies regarding recreational opportunities include:

- *Leadership* – It is the State responsibility, through its Department of Parks and Recreation, to encourage and stimulate active and coordinated participation of appropriate federal, state, and local agencies, as well as the private sector, in providing areas, facilities, equipment, leadership, and services to meet the recreational needs of the state's population.
- *Opportunities* –It is State policy that parks, open space lands, lake resources, reservoirs, rivers and riparian resources, seashores, and beaches will be planned to optimize the opportunities for the myriad of recreation experiences without threatening or disturbing the natural or cultural resources of the area.
- *Equity* – It is State policy to provide access to a wide range of opportunities for all segments of California's diverse populations, and ensure that all citizens have fair and equitable access to attractive recreation opportunities that serve their needs and desires.
- *Local Responsibility* – It is State policy that government entities closest to the recreation resources and particularly to the sources of recreation demand have the primary responsibility for providing needed recreation opportunities.
- *Efficiencies* – The State recreation facilities shall be provided by the most efficient, effective, and economical means available.
- *Linkages* – It is State policy to "acquire and develop, for recreation, open space, and habitat protection purposes, trail and landscape linkages between public lands operated by different jurisdictions.
- *Access* – It is State policy to encourage the use of public transportation to access park and recreation facilities, and to work with transportation providers to develop and improve such means of access.

- *Cooperation* – It is State policy that the private sector shall be encouraged to develop and operate a wide range of recreational opportunities on both private and appropriate public lands.
- *Land Acquisition* – It is State policy that adequate suppliers of land be acquired through a selective acquisition program to meet the future needs of the public.
- *Information* – It is State policy that varied educational, informational, and outreach programs should be undertaken and information distributed about recreation opportunities to all segments of the population so that access is not limited by lack of information.
- *Recreation Ethic* – It is State policy to encourage people to recreate carefully and wisely with a view towards the needs of future generations of recreationists who will also want quality opportunities.
- *Natural and Cultural Resources* – It is State policy that environmental, scenic, and cultural resources that recreation areas contain, and which constitute a public trust, shall be protected and interpreted for the benefit of future generations.
- *Safety* – It is State policy that Californians shall be provided recreation facilities that are safe and secure.

4.2.2 Department of Parks and Recreation, *Public Opinions and Attitudes on Outdoor Recreation in California*, 1997

The *Public Opinions and Attitudes on Outdoor Recreation in California* survey (the Survey) was conducted as part of the 1998 revision of the Outdoor Recreation Plan. The Survey was undertaken by the California DPR, with the participation and strong support of the BLM, National Park Service (NPS), and USFS. A random sample of 2,010 California households was used for the Study. The Study focused on two major areas of inquiry:

(1) Public attitudes, opinions, and values with respect to outdoor recreation in California.

(2) Demand for and current participation in 43 selected types of outdoor recreation activities.

Major findings of the Survey relevant to the Oroville Project include:

- Approximately 39 percent of respondents prefer natural and undeveloped areas for recreation
- Approximately 30 percent of respondents prefer nature-oriented parks and recreation areas
- Some of the more popular state-wide recreational activities (and percentage of state-wide participation by respondents) that were identified and that occur at the Oroville Project include; recreational walking (84 percent), driving for pleasure (68 percent), picnicking in developed sites (65 percent), trail hiking (58 percent), swimming in lakes, etc (57 percent), general nature wildlife study (54 percent), camping in developed sites (52 percent), freshwater fishing (37 percent), camping in primitive areas (26 percent), power boating (21 percent), kayaking/row boating/canoeing (18 percent), mountain biking (18

percent), horseback riding (14 percent), water skiing (13 percent), hunting (9 percent) and sail boating and windsurfing (7 percent).

- The survey indicates latent State-wide demand for the following ranked recreational activities occurring at the Oroville Project: recreational walking (#1), camping in developed sites (# 2), trail hiking (#3), swimming in lakes/rivers/ocean (#6), general nature wildlife study (#7), camping in primitive areas (#9), beach activities (#10), freshwater fishing (#12), picnicking in developed sites (#13), horseback riding (#15), kayaking/rowboating/canoeing (#21), mountain biking (#22), power boating (#30) and sail boating and windsurfing (#37).

In terms of public spending priorities, the Survey indicates that Californians support policies that focus more on existing facilities rather than expanding opportunities for outdoor recreation areas and facilities. In addition, Californians tend to want more local community parks; more horseback riding, hiking and/or mountain biking areas where no motorized vehicles are allowed; more campgrounds and fewer commercial businesses within public parks; and fewer areas for off-road vehicles.

4.2.3 Department of Parks and Recreation, *Recreation Needs in California*, 1983

[Note: Need to talk to DPR to discuss whether this plan is still relevant.]

4.2.4 Department of Parks and Recreation, *Lake Oroville State Recreation Area Resource Management Plan and General Development Plan*, 1973

This Lake Oroville State Recreation Area (LOSRA) Resource Management Plan (RMP) was developed by the DPR in 1973, and is still in use today. The RMP describes allowable recreational uses and intensities for various areas around the lake, such as Bidwell Canyon, Lime Saddle, Goat Ranch, and others. Recreational intensities described in the RMP are primarily tied to slope and resource protection constraints. The RMP also describes the existing and proposed recreational development (as of 1973) within 15 areas of the park, including Kelley Ridge, Bidwell Canyon, Loafer Creek, Spillway Launching Ramp, Lime Saddle, Thermalito Forebay, and other areas. These developments include overnight facilities (camping sites, group camps, cabins, and lodges), day-use facilities (parking, picnic units, and swimming beaches), and boating facilities (launching lanes, car/trailer parking, and marina slips).

Management policies contained in the RMP emphasize that lands and resources at LOSRA are to be managed to provide recreational opportunities and facilities in a natural or quasi-natural setting. The purpose of the RMP is to "…perpetuate, enhance, and make available to the public the recreational opportunities afforded by Lake Oroville, Thermalito Forebay, and adjacent land and water areas and to protect all environmental amenities so that they make an optimum contribution to public enjoyment of the area."

4.2.5 Department of Water Resources, *Proposed Amended Recreation Plan for Lake Oroville State Recreation Area*, 1993

In compliance with the FERC Order of October 1, 1992, the DWR adopted the Amended Recreation Plan (ARP) in 1993 as the recreation plan for the LOSRA, which supercedes the 1966

plan, Bulletin 117-6. (The initial Recreation Plan was submitted in 1991, yet public dissatisfaction with the document caused FERC to require DWR to develop this amended plan for the LOSRA.) The 1993 ARP describes the recent improvements and the commitments of DWR to construct specific facilities and take actions to address the fisheries and recreation needs at LOSRA deemed necessary by FERC. The 1993 ARP also detailed the time frame for the completion of additional proposed projects. The DWR acknowledges in the ARP that as the licensee, they are responsible for funding specific improvements. The ARP describes the fish and wildlife resources, facilities, local area, user patterns, operation of LOSRA facilities, economic considerations, recreation plan, and the fisheries management plan.

The ARP acknowledges that recreation activities and preferences have changed over time (1966 to 1993), which has resulted in reduced demand for boat use and fishing, and increased demand for equestrian, bike, and hiking trails. Another finding was that use patterns in 1993 have changed due to low water levels and temporarily inaccessible or seasonally unusable facilities. The ARP puts forth recommendations for facility expansion and modification in light of these findings. Many of these recommendations have since been implemented.

In terms of Lake Oroville fisheries, ARP goals include developing a multi-species fishery in Lake Oroville that makes optimum use of the available habitat and forage base while sustaining the existing fisheries above current levels. This development could include management of the bass fishery to achieve the California Fish and Game Commission's designation of Lake Oroville as a "Trophy Black Bass Water."

The ARP states that Lake Oroville recreational facilities must be responsive to fluctuating water levels, topography that restricts uses during low water, temperatures that deter use during the peak summer period, a highway system that is conducive to local or destination-type uses, and reasonable user costs. The facilities recently developed at Lake Oroville have taken these factors into consideration, while incorporating cost effective development focusing on areas that would receive high usage. For example, facilities around the Thermalito Afterbay (such as Monument Hill) have been developed to mitigate against low pool elevations that restrict usage on Lake Oroville. Recreation facilities (Bidwell and Spillway) on Lake Oroville have been upgraded to take into account periods of low pool elevations, such as extending the length of boat launch ramps.

4.2.6 Department of Water Resources, *The California Water Plan Update*, 1994. (Based on DWR, California Water Plan Update: Bulletin 160-98, 1998)

[Note: Will compare the 1998 Update with the 1994 Bulletin for Final Report.]

In 1957, the California DWR published Bulletin 3, the California Water Plan. Bulletin 3 was followed by the Bulletin 160 series, published six times between 1966 and 1993, updating the California Water Plan. A 1991 amendment to the California Water Code directed the DWR to update the plan every 5 years to address potential water shortages.

The Bulletin 160 series assesses California's water needs and evaluates water supplies, to quantify the gap between future water demands and water supplies. The series presents a statewide overview of current water management activities and provides water managers with a

framework for making decisions. Bulletin 160-98 is the latest in the series and evaluates water management options that could improve California's water supply reliability and uses a planning horizon of 1995-2020.

Much of Bulletin 160-98 is devoted to identifying and analyzing options for improving water supply reliability. Water management options available to, and being considered by, local agencies form the building blocks of evaluations prepared for each of the State's 10 major hydrological regions. The bulletin provides a snapshot, at an appraisal level of detail, of how actions planned by California water managers could reduce the gap between supplies and demands. Rather than providing enforceable policies for water managers to follow, Bulletin 160-98 recommends improved strategies for water managers and local planners to consider.

4.2.7 Department of Water Resources, *Lake Oroville Fisheries Habitat Improvement Plan*, 1995

In response to the September 22, 1994, FERC Order, the DWR adopted the *Lake Oroville Fisheries Habitat Improvement Plan* in 1995 to improve fish habitat and establish a schedule for implementation. Due to the magnitude of Lake Oroville's water level fluctuations, steep slopes, and poor soils, and encroachment of terrestrial vegetation, the establishment of rooted aquatic vegetation is extremely limited. A major Plan objective includes increasing the productivity of fisheries within specific areas and the entire lake.

Although the *Lake Oroville Fisheries Habitat Improvement Plan* focuses on projects to be implemented before the 1998-99 season, it provides a template for long-term habitat enhancement plans for fisheries. These fisheries are a very important component of the overall recreation and tourism industry in the Oroville area. Therefore, the local community, as well as local and statewide fishing organizations, has expressed a strong desire for DWR to be involved in enhancing and maintaining strong fisheries at Lake Oroville. These desires have been presented to FERC on numerous occasions and have resulted in FERC's attention to fisheries at the lake.

4.2.8 Department of Fish and Game, *Oroville Wildlife Area Management Plan*, 1978

In 1962, the Director of Water Resources declared that public interest and necessity required the acquisition of the Oroville Borrow Area (the clay source for the construction of the Lake Oroville Dam) for fish and wildlife enhancement and recreation. In total, 5,500 acres were transferred from DWR to DFG for creation of the Oroville Wildlife Area (OWA) on August 12, 1968. In 1978, the DFG developed the *Oroville Wildlife Area Management Plan* (Management Plan). The purpose of the Management Plan was to provide for the preservation and enhancement of the Oroville Wildlife Area and for the reasonable use and enjoyment by the public.

The Management Plan describes the plan's purpose, description of the area, history of the site, present (as of 1978) situation and problems, and recommended action programs. The Management Plan states that one of the three primary objectives of the area is to provide for the recreational, scientific, and educational use of the area. The Management Plan also states that destructive uses and activities incompatible with wildlife and fisheries objectives (that were

present at the time the Management Plan was written) will be eliminated through enforcement of existing regulations or development of additional regulations if necessary.

4.2.9 Department of Fish and Game, *California Regulations on Hunting and Other Public Uses on State and Federal Areas*, 2002

The *California Regulations on Hunting and Other Public Uses on State and Federal Areas* (the Regulations) is not a comprehensive plan per se, but it does govern hunting on state and federally owned lands in California and includes specific management direction for the Oroville Wildlife Area (OWA). Included in the Regulations are hunting license provisions and requirements; application and fee information; a listing of all hunting areas throughout the state, including wildlife areas, recreation areas, and national forests; and detailed information regarding area locations and boundaries, hunting practices and regulations, permit requirements, and firearms and archery equipment regulations in each hunting area.

The OWA, which is located in the Project area, is designated as a "Type C" hunting area. As a Type C hunting area, a permit or pass is not required for most uses. The OWA is open to hunting between September 1 and January 31 and during spring turkey season. However, special permits are required during the spring turkey season and are issued by drawing each year. The possession and use of rifles and pistols are prohibited in the wildlife area except in the designated target practice area, which is open all year.

Regulations within the OWA that influence the use of the area include:

- Boating is allowed only on Thermalito Afterbay. Boats may only be launched from designated launch areas. Boating may be restricted to certain zones designated by the department and boat speeds may not exceed 5 miles per hour.
- Camping is only permitted in designated campsites. Camping on the wildlife area is limited to not more than 7 consecutive days and not more than 14 days total in any calendar year, except by written permission of the Regional Manager.
- Dog training is allowed only in designated areas and only from July 1 through March 15.
- Fires are allowed only in portable gas stoves as sites designated for camping.
- Horses are restricted to roads open to vehicles and to areas within 25 feet of exterior boundary fences.

4.2.10 California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and State Board of Forestry, *The California Fire Plan*, 1999

[Note: Did not receive a copy from David Hawks (CDF) in time to include here.]

4.2.11 California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection and State Board of Forestry, *California Fire Plan: A Framework for Minimizing Costs and Losses From Wildland Fire*, 1996

In 1996, the State Board of Forestry and CDF adopted a comprehensive update of the fire plan for wildland fire protection in California. The *California Fire Plan* establishes a state-wide framework to identify areas of concentrated assets and high risk, to create a more efficient fire protection system, to provide for citizen involvement, to identify pre-fire management needs, to

encourage an integrated intergovernmental approach, and to enable policy makers and public to focus on effective ways to reduce future costs and losses from wildfires.

The overall goal of the California Fire Plan is to reduce total costs and losses from wildland fire in California by protecting assets at risk through focused prefire management prescriptions and increase initial attack success. The strategic objectives are: (1) to create wildfire protection zones that reduce the risks to citizens and firefighters, (2) to assess all wildlands, not just the state responsibility areas, (3) to identify and analyze key policy issues and develop recommendations for changes in public policy, (4) to have strong fiscal policy focus and monitor the wildland fire protection system in fiscal terms, (5) to translate the analyses into public policies.

The California Fire Plan applies to the Lake Oroville hydroelectric relicensing Project indirectly, because the information within the Plan is refined at the ranger unit level. The Project is located within Battalions Three, Five, and Six of the Butte Unit.

4.2.12 California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection Butte Unit, *Fire Management Plan*, 2002

The Butte Unit Fire Management Plan (Fire Management Plan) documents the assessment of fire management within the Butte Unit and identifies strategic areas for pre-fire planning and fuel treatment to reduce destruction and costs associated with wildfire. The Plan systematically assesses the existing level of wildland fire protection service, identifies high-risk and high-value areas where potential exists for costly and damaging wildfires, ranks these areas in terms of priority needs, and prescribes methods to reduce future costs and losses.

The Fire Management Plan has four components:

(1) Level of service
(2) Assets at risk
(3) Hazardous fuels
(4) Historic fire weather

To reduce the destruction and costs associated with wildfire, the Fire Management Plan aims to protect assets at risk through focused pre-fire management prescriptions, and in turn to improve initial attack success. The Fire Management Plan identifies five strategic objectives:

(1) Wildfire Protection Zones – Create wildfire protection zones that reduce the risk to citizens and firefighters.

(2) Initial Attack Success – Assess the initial attack fire suppression success of wildland fires on lands of similar vegetation type. This is measured in terms of percentage of fires that are successfully controlled before unacceptable costs and losses occur. The analysis can be used to determine the level of success of both the department and the unit.

(3) Assets Protected – Utilize a methodology for defining and protecting assets and determining their degree of risk from wildfire. The assets at risk addressed in the

plan are life safety (citizen and firefighter), watersheds and water quality, timber, wildlife and wildlife habitat, rural communities, unique areas (scenic, cultural, and historic), recreation, range, property in the form of structures, and air quality.

(4) Fire Management Prescriptions – Develop fire management prescriptions that focus on alternative means of protecting assets at risk. Prescriptions may include a combination of fuel modification, ignition, management, fire-wise planning and education, and pre-development planning. Specific activities include but are not limited to land use planning and associated regulations, educational programs and public information, department infrastructure including fire stations and water systems, fuels management and forest health. Pre-fire management prescriptions will also identify those who will benefit from such work and consequently those who should share in the project costs.

(5) Fiscal Framework – Use the fiscal framework being developed by the State Board of Forestry and CDF for assessing and monitoring annual and long-term changes in California's wildland fire protection systems. Incorporate pre-fire workload analyses (PWA) in an attempt to provide relevant data to guide in the development of the fiscal framework and public policy.

The Project area is primarily located within the service area of Battalion Six, although portions of the Project area are also located within Battalion Three and Five service areas of the Plan. The primary causes of fires in the Project vicinity are arson, debris burning, equipment use, and children playing with fire. Fire prevention programs and objectives in Battalions Five and Six include educating the community on fire prevention, conducting fire inspections throughout the battalions, establishing a fire safety council, improving vegetation management programs, and improving accuracy/cause determination in preliminary fire investigations.

4.3 LOCAL PLANS

There are three local entities in the Project area that have land planning and/or management responsibilities. The Butte County Association of Governments (BCAG) is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and Regional Transportation Planning Agency (RTPA) for Butte County and is responsible for the preparation of all federal and state transportation plans and programs for securing transportation funds. BCAG is an association of local governments formed by Butte County and the cities of Biggs, Chico, Gridley, Oroville and the Town of Paradise. In addition to BCAG, Butte County, and the City of Oroville also have comprehensive and/or management plans for lands in the Project area.

Although the majority of land in the Project area is managed by State agencies, there are considerable City and County lands that border the Project boundary. The following sections discuss the local plans that pertain to the Project area.

4.3.1 Regional Plans

4.3.1.1 BCAG, Butte County 2001 Regional Transportation Plan, 2001

The Butte County Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) was developed to fulfill the state requirements of California Senate Bill 45 and the passage of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA 21) by Congress in June 1998. In accordance with state law, BCAG has prepared the regional transportation plans for Butte County every three years, the latest of which was adopted in 2001. The Butte County RTP is a 20-year, long range plan that is intended to attain an efficient and environmentally sound multi-modal transportation system. The RTP contains three required elements: (1) a policy element that reflects the mobility goals, policies and objectives of the region; (2) an action element that identifies programs and actions to implement the RTP; and (3) a financial element that summarizes the cost of implementing the projects in the RTP.

Within the policy element of the RTP, "Land Use Coordination" and "Pedestrian and Bikeways" policies are most applicable to the proposed Project. Land Use Coordination policies are intended to facilitate the development of the most efficient and effective transportation system possible through existing and future land development forms. Specific policies include assisting jurisdictions in the preparation of circulation analyses with the countywide transportation model, and encouraging agencies to require land uses that produce significant trip generation utilize roadways with adequate capacity and design standards for all transportation modes.

The objective of Pedestrian and Bikeways policies in the RTP is to "provide a safe, convenient, and efficient non-motorized transportation system which is part of a balanced overall transportation system." Specifically, RTP policies state that local agencies should encourage: the development of trails to increase access to wilderness and recreational areas of the region, consideration of bicycles and pedestrians when improving existing roadways; and the incorporation of non-motorized facilities in planned street improvement projects where possible.

The RTP also includes an entire chapter on non-motorized transportation action items. This chapter identifies existing conditions and plans for bikeways on a jurisdictional and regional basis, and provides short and long range policy direction that is consistent and supportive of the goals, policies, and objectives contained in the more specific *1998 Countywide Bikeway Master Plan*. The RTP makes reference to its support for the general projects included in the *Countywide Bikeway Master Plan*, as well as support for the 41-mile bicycle trail loop around the Feather River, and trails located within the Oroville Dam State Recreation Area.

4.3.1.2 BCAG, Countywide Bikeway Master Plan, 1998

The Countywide Bikeway Master Plan for Butte County (the Bikeway Plan) was developed by the BCAG, with input from bikeway advocates, staff from each city and the county, the transportation management association, and the county public. The primary purpose of the plan is to designate a regional bikeway system for Butte County that focuses on area-wide bikeway connections.

The Bikeway Plan details the regional setting of Butte County as it applies to bicycle transportation, including details regarding regionally significant land use patterns, commute

patterns, and existing bicycle-related facilities. The Bikeway Plan then details the goals, objectives, and policies, discusses the county's capital improvement program, and details the financial elements as related to bicycling in Butte County. The Bikeway Plan details the existing and planned bikeways and bicycle facilities throughout the county (as of September 1998). Existing facilities in the Oroville urban area include Class I bike paths along the Feather River from Table Mountain Boulevard to River Bend Park and on Table Mountain Boulevard across Feather River Bridge, and a Class II bike lane on Foothill Boulevard from Olive Highway to the city limit (near Pinedale Avenue). A Class I bike path along the south side of Feather River from the SR 162 Bridge over Feather River to Lake Oroville State Recreation Area is listed in the plan as scheduled for construction during 1998 and 1999. The plan also lists five Class I and 42 Class II proposed bicycle paths that are not yet scheduled for implementation. There are no regional bikeways in the Oroville area or in the Project area.

The Bikeway Plan contains specific goals, objectives, and policies. Most are general in nature and do not specifically relate to the Project area (although the Project area is within the area covered by the plan). One of the goals in the Bikeway Plan does mention the Project specifically and is included below:

> *Goal 6*: Develop a bikeway system that encourages and facilitates recreational use.
>
> Objective: Encourage recreational bicycling by providing a bikeway system that responds to the riding needs of both the avid cyclist and the "weekend" rider.
>
> Policies: Emphasize connections to regional recreation centers, such as Lake Oroville and Bidwell Park; plan bikeway facilities to take full advantage of the scenic qualities of Butte County for the enjoyment of residents and visitors alike; provide adequate bicycle parking facilities at regional recreation areas where warranted by demand.

In addition to goals, objectives and policies, the Bikeway Plan identifies existing and planned Class I and II bikeways and planned bicycle related facilities in the Oroville area. It also mentions that the City of Oroville Bicycle Transportation Plan was scheduled (at the time of writing this plan) to be adopted in October of 1998. Funding sources and design standards are also included in the plan.

4.3.2 County Plans

4.3.2.1 County of Butte, Butte County General Plan, 1996

Local governments have been directed by the State of California to prepare and adopt a general plan per Section 65302 (a) of the California Government Code. In compliance with California Law, the *Butte County General Plan* (the General Plan) was adopted in 1996 by the County of Butte and the Butte County Association of Governments. The purpose of this document is to provide a complete statement of the policies and intentions regarding future development of land over a planning horizon of 20 years, which extends to the year 2016.

The General Plan contains twelve elements, including Land Use, Circulation, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Seismic Safety, Safety, Noise, Scenic Highways, Recreation, Economy, and Agriculture. California law does not exclude the area of incorporated cities from

the coverage of county general plans. Therefore, the proposals in the Land Use Element, or the element most relevant to the Project, are county-wide in scope and are not limited to unincorporated areas. The most recent adoption of this element occurred in January 2000.

The land use element of the General Plan designates the following land use categories within the Project area: (1) Grazing and Open Land, and (2) Low Density Residential. These land uses, including their primary and secondary uses and intensity of use, are described below.

Grazing and Open Land

Primary Uses: Livestock grazing, animal husbandry, intense animal uses and animal matter processing.

Secondary Uses: Resource extraction and processing, forestry, plant crops, agricultural support services, outdoor recreation facilities, airports, dwellings, utilities, environmental preservation activities, public and quasi-public uses and home occupations.

Intensity of Use: Minimum parcel size of 40 acres. Gross density could vary from 20 to 40 acres per dwelling unit provided at least 80 percent of the total acreage of a Project is set aside for open space uses. One single-family dwelling per parcel with additional housing for on-site employees is encouraged.

Low Density Residential

Primary Uses: Detached single-family dwellings at urban densities

Secondary Uses: Agricultural uses, animal husbandry, home occupations, outdoor recreation facilities, utilities, public and quasi-public uses, group quarters and care homes.

Intensity of Use: Zoning allows net parcel sizes of 1 acre to 6,500 square feet. One single-family dwelling per parcel with other residential uses limited to a maximum density of six dwelling units per gross acre. Home occupations, farm animals, other uses and setbacks regulated to maintain single-family residential character.

The General Plan contains a number of policies regarding the operation and management of Lake Oroville. The County's policies are primarily related to enhancement of recreational and biological resources at Lake Oroville, as well as the reduction of potential flood and seismic hazards. Butte County has indicated its strong interest in promoting more recreational development around the reservoir, and there appears to be support for land use and zoning designations around the reservoir that would make this development possible. The County policies relevant to Lake Oroville are described below in Table 4-5, organized by element of the General Plan.

Table 4-5. Butte County General Plan Policies Related to Lake Oroville.

Element	Policy Statement
Land Use	Biological Habitat: Lake Oroville and Butte County's larger streams are highly valuable habitats for trout, salmon, bass, and other game fish. Several rare and/or endangered plants and animal species are found within the county. Policy 6.5.a. Regulate development in identified winter deer ranges to facilitate the survival of deer herds. Policy 6.5.b. Prevent development and site clearance other than river bank protection of marshes and significant riparian habitats. Policy 6.5.c. Limit development which would increase sediment loads in prime fishing waters. Policy 6.5.d. Regulate development to facilitate survival of identified rare or endangered plants and animals. Geologic Hazards: The risk of landslides is greatest in areas with steep slopes, weak rock, and high rainfall; some areas around Lake Oroville and its branches have very high risk. Erosion potential varies by the same factors but is greatest in granite areas. Findings and policies on these subjects and other geologic hazards are presented in the Safety Element adopted in 1977. Policy 7.4.a. Correlate allowable density of development to potential for landslides, erosion and other types of land instability.
Open Space	Open Space for Outdoor Recreation: The DPR manages the extensive recreation facilities around Lake Oroville and the Thermalito Bays. Policy L: The Butte County should encourage the DPR to complete their development of recreational facilities in the Lake Oroville State Recreation Area.
Recreation	Policy 5: Lake Oroville and Facilities: Proposed development (parking, camp, picnic, boat ramp, comfort station, trailer, food, gasoline, oil, water, observation points and other facilities to serve the recreation minded public) at the following facilities: Lime Saddle, Foreman Creek, Bloomer, Craig, Kelly Ridge, Forebay, Loafer Creek, Goat Ranch, Afterbay, Potter Ravine, Fish Hatchery, etc. Development Agencies: County, Recreation District and State Department Parks and Recreation.

Source: Butte County (2000)

4.3.3 Municipal Plans

4.3.3.1 City of Oroville, City of Oroville General Plan, 1995

The City of Oroville General Plan (General Plan) is a statement of Oroville's vision of its long-term future, focusing on the physical components that comprise the City. The General Plan consists of nine sections and details the City's land use, design, circulation, open space, natural resources, and conservation, public facilities and services, safety, and noise goals, objectives, policies, and designations. The objectives and goals outlined in the General Plan are intended to be the framework within which the City will make future decisions related to the community.

The 84 square mile planning area covered by the General Plan is comprised of seven planning sectors that include the Oroville Sphere of Influence (as defined by the Butte County Local Agency Formation Commission), and areas immediately to the west, south, and east. The General Plan directly addresses the issues of housing, conservation, recreation, industry, and

circulation, as well as a number of others. Among the themes of the General Plan that are relevant to the Project area are:

> *Growth:* The Plan encourages new industries and a higher population growth rate in order to improve the City's economy.
>
> *Environmental Awareness and Conservation*: The General Plan calls for a relatively high level of ongoing management and planning for the City's natural and cultural resources, and encourages the conservation of oak woodlands, wetlands, and riparian corridors, in particular, in order to enhance the quality of life in the area relative to nearby metropolitan areas.

The Land Use Element of the General Plan designates areas near the Project as "Medium Density Residential" and "Parks." These land use designations are described below.

> *Medium Density Residential*. Medium density residential land uses in the Oroville Planning Area consist of single-family residential development with approximately two to six units per gross acre on land under 30 percent slope. This land use is primarily found in the Kelley Ridge area of the Oroville Planning Area.
>
> *Parks*. This land use category includes public parks, golf courses, or other appropriate uses. A recreational vehicle park or campground may be permitted within areas designated Parks as a conditional use permit. This land use in the Project vicinity is primarily found near the Oroville Dam, and contains such recreational areas as the Bidwell Canyon Campground and the Lake Oroville Visitor Center, which are managed by the DPR.

General Plan policies that relate to the operation and management of Lake Oroville generally include enhancement of recreational and biological resources at Lake Oroville, as well as the reduction of potential flood and seismic hazards. Policies that specifically mention the Project are listed in Table 4-6, organized by element of the General Plan.

4.3.3.2 City of Oroville, Bicycle Transportation Plan, 1998

The City of Oroville *Bicycle Transportation Plan*, adopted in December 1998, provides the most up to date regulations for bicycles in the City of Oroville. This document states that "depending on the location, overall development of non-motorized facilities may be a responsibility of local, state, or federal government." The City of Oroville plans all bikeways within its sphere of influence. It should be noted that the planning and implementation of bikeways is not a mandated process, but one undertaken by communities at their discretion. The City of Oroville *Bicycle Transportation Plan* is broken down into 8 chapters. Chapter 7 (Goals, Objectives, and Policies) is the portion of the City of Oroville *Bicycle Transportation Plan* that relates most closely to the issues of the Project. The City of Oroville General Plan has specific goals and policies related to bicycle and pedestrian paths, which are incorporated to form the core of the policy element of this bicycle transportation plan. The plan lists four goals, which include:

- Provide a system of Class I and Class II bikeways and multi-use recreational trails throughout the Oroville Urban Area that will increase bicycle access to major facilities,

Table 4-6. City of Oroville General Plan Policies that Mention the Project.

Element	Policy Statement	
City Design	Policy 4x:	Request the state to landscape and develop the Thermalito Afterbay as a destination water recreation park which defines the western boundary of the community in accordance with the State's original mater plan of recreation development associated with the FERC permit.
	Policy 4y:	Encourage the efforts of the Feather River Parks and Recreation Department in the North Forebay, Nelson Ballpark expansion, and development of River Bend Park.
Open Space, Natural Resources and Conservation	Policy 6.11s:	Coordinate with the DFG to ensure the ongoing operation of the Feather River Fish Hatchery.
	Policy 6.11w:	Work with the DFG to ensure the preservation and enhancement of species or resident and anadromous fish along the Feather River, in Lake Oroville, and throughout the Planning Area.
Safety	Policy 8.10e:	Monitor studies related to induced seismicity; if further studies establish a conclusive relationship between reservoir drawdown, refilling, and seismic activity, encourage the DWR to manage the Oroville Dam water regime to reduce risk (evidence thus far suggests a relationship between reservoir drawdown, refill, and subsequent seismic activity. This was seen in the 1975 Cleveland Hills earthquake, thought to have occurred after unprecedented drawdown and refilling of Lake Oroville).
	Policy 8.20m:	Identify critical facilities in flood hazard areas and within the Oroville Dam inundation area, and seek ways to improve their level of protection, if possible (Critical facilities provide fire and emergency services, water, electricity, gas supply, sewage disposal, communications, and transportation).
	Policy 8.20o:	In the event of dam failure on the Oroville Dam, implement emergency measures consistent with the city's Multi-hazard Functional Disaster Plan (Dam failure, while considered unlikely, is among the hazards mentioned in the City's Multi-hazard Functional Disaster Plan).

Source: City of Oroville (1995).

shopping, schools, work centers, and points of interest, and will increase the utility of bicycles not only for recreation, but also as a viable mode of alternative transportation.

- Improve safety conditions, efficiency, and comfort for bicyclists and pedestrians through traffic engineering and law enforcement efforts.
- Provide adequate bicycle support facilities.
- Develop a bikeway system that encourages and facilitates recreational use.

Parts of the Project area (the Diversion Pool, Power Canal, Thermalito Forebay, Thermalito Afterbay, Spillway, and OWA) that have bicycle paths traveling by them and are part of the City's bikeway system. The plan suggests a need for bicycle support facilities, some of which could be associated with bikeways in and near the Project.

4.4 PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED DOCUMENTS TO REEVALUATE

[Note to Jim Martin and LUWG: We should reconsider including these documents; upon closer look, they are not management plans. They are reports that do not offer future management direction.]

- **Department of Water Resources, *1999 Lake Oroville Annual Report of Fish Stocking and Fish Habitat Improvements*, 2000.**

- **Department of Water Resources, *Concerning the operation of the Oroville Division of the State Water Project for management of fish and wildlife*, 1983.**

- **Department of Fish and Game, Draft Plant List for the Oroville Wildlife Management Area, 1995.**

- **Department of Finance, City/County Population and Housing Estimates, 2000.**