

Summary of Public Comments

Lake Berryessa Visitor Services Plan (VSP)

First Formal Public Comment Opportunity from Bulletin #2, May 2001

This summary is organized in the same format as VSP Bulletin #2. Each comment was entered under the heading/question to which it seemed to most directly apply. In cases where we could not determine a specific heading, the comment was entered where it made the most sense or in the last 'General' category. All public comments are in *italics*, and similar comments received from multiple individuals were only entered once. Comments containing confusing punctuation or grammar were 'cleaned up.' Comments preceded by ** are followed by clarification from Reclamation in **bold text** and not indented. For the sake of clarity, we will refer to the Bureau of Reclamation throughout this document as "BOR."

Common Conditions - Refers to various situations that are intended to be present in any options discussed. This means that these conditions have been identified as 'unconditional' for the future of Lake Berryessa. The Common Conditions are necessary for many reasons including compliance with laws and regulations and concerns regarding public health and safety. Facilities and programs included in this category are:

Common Conditions RE: Concessionaire Operations

< Elimination of long-term Dry Sites.

We have spent over 30 years at Spanish Flat and would like to understand the reasoning behind BOR's position on this subject. To eliminate this type of activity without options does not seem fair to us.

I realize BOR took action against long-term dry sites that were improperly disposing of black/gray water; however, did you take any action on short-term camping sites where this activity goes on all the time?

< Compliance with applicable environmental, health and safety, and construction laws, regulations/codes.

We could not agree more with this proposed change in policy.

< Elimination of long-term trailers and support facilities, including private docks, stairways, or other built facilities, from the flood zone (455 mean sea level [msl] and below). (Please note: The following section includes comments regarding removal of trailers and other support facilities not in the designated 455 msl flood zone).

***Where did the number 455 feet msl and back 100 yards come from? Did BOR make that number up so they can get rid of all the buildings and trailers around the lake?*

BOR Response #1 - The 455 msl was established when Monticello Dam was constructed in a standard engineering manner and has nothing to do with the VSP. The 100 yard setback from 455 msl was introduced as part of the planning process to identify an area called "lakeshore." This statement does not address removal of ANY facilities above 455 msl, only those below.

There are areas around the lake that benefit from properly constructed stairs as these conveniences allow safe access to lakeside beaches during lower water conditions. I would be concerned if they were removed that access to these areas would become much more limited and even dangerous. In our opinion, people would continue to access the beach areas and would do more environmental damage to the area in the process. We would suggest that if these private items are removed, that they be replaced by conveniently located public equivalents.

I understand and agree that long-term homes or other structures, which would be damaged by occasional submersion or could create a contamination hazard, are inappropriate for the floodplain area (i.e. below the 455' level); however, these inappropriate structures do not include shoreline walls, private stairs, homeowner docks, driveways, picnic tables, etc. These structures will tolerate occasional submersion without contaminating or otherwise hindering enjoyment of the lake by the public. As such, there is no reason to mandate removal of these structures.

*Why must mobile homes be removed? ... I understand and agree with Dry Sites being removed ... **Why aren't we counted as general public? ... We have paid to be on the lake 24 hrs a day, 7 days a week, 12 months a year. ... I have*

heard BOR has complaints against the concessionaires but who has been checking on the concessionaires for the past 10 or 15 years? What is 455 msl; I was told that is the height of the dam, and you have stated "elimination of long-term trailers and support facilities" from the flood zone. If 455 msl is the height of the dam, then when was the last time it went over, isn't that what the Glory Hole is for? Why eliminate everything below the dam if it hasn't been an issue for the last 40 years? Do you really think people don't use the lake because of the mobile homes? ... We don't even take our boat out on the holiday weekends because it is so crazy, and you want to bring more people to the lake.

BOR Response #2 - Mobile home owners are a part of the public; however, they are a special interest group in the same way that an environmental organization, water skiing club, or bicycle club are classified. This does not mean that their special interest is not allowable, but it does mean that it must be determined to be necessary and appropriate and not restrictive of other users in a substantial manner.

Stairwells leading to the lake are public access; these should be maintained by the concessionaire.

RV parks, cabins, motels, camping, and day use should be permitted; however, trailers should not be allowed unless maintained to the level of Steele Park and no waterfront sites should be allowed (i.e. between a developed road and the lake). This is my compromise position; I (really) think trailer sites should not be allowed at all and should be replaced with the above uses.

The trailer parks are ugly, take up valuable real estate, and restrict the use of the lake in those areas to a very few people! And they are an environmental disaster by many reports. They have for years ignored and resisted cleanup orders. Those long-term tenants and the concessionaires need to be tossed out. It is the right thing to do - to make for a broader and better use of the lake by more citizens.

There is too much emphasis on long-term, stationary mobile homes at private resorts. While some of these resorts are very responsible and no doubt play a critical role in the provision of recreation opportunities at the lake, they are, in essence, exclusive, and primarily emphasize mechanized and motorized camping and boating. Several of the resorts simply do not take care of their premises or comply with public health and safety codes. My recommendation: let the responsible ones stay, but do not renew leases for those resorts who do not comply with all regulations.

There should be minimal additional lakeshore development. The existing resorts that remain should be redeveloped.

Any development should be such that it does not diminish the environment of the lake. Current resorts sprawl haphazardly across the landscape. There should not be additional development, and the amount of development currently at the lake should be reduced. The lake should be returned to a more natural state, with fewer resorts, and the resorts that remain should be of a higher quality.

Not all concessions should remain. There should be fewer concessions, and they should take less space than current concessions. While there should be marinas, restaurants, and launch ramps, expansion should be limited or not allowed if it takes up more land area.

Lakeshore development should be limited and of a high density so as to maximize the amount of development in a minimum of area. Any lakeshore development should follow strict guidelines and have some form of design review to make sure that random building does not occur as was the case with current resorts.

The present usage should be continued with attention to upgrading health and safety corrections. The general public cannot financially support the existing concessions as the long-term permittees have done. Also, in the winter the only users are the long-term trailer owners.

The public campers make a bigger mess than the long-term trailer owners. Why don't you get on them about gray water and them washing their dishes right on the ground?

As a senior citizen and trailer owner, I am able to afford to enjoy the area with my children and grandchildren. Other lakes in CA are not affordable to stay on permanently. ... There is no need to greatly change the lake's environment

from what it is today. It provides a varied choice of use to a broad group of people. Additional commercial use will not only require change at the lake but to the infrastructure. It will also increase the road impacts, fire control, and law enforcement needs. ... Please consider these comments from one who wishes to continue the lake as it was established in 1958 so that I may continue to share my life experiences with my extended family as planned.

***The VSP goal of totally eliminating exclusive use sites is not consistent with the Resource Area Management Plan (RAMP) Preferred Actions. ... The Executive Summary of the RAMP states, "Current long-term exclusive uses assist in supporting necessary services for the short-term users and low cost public access." Elimination of exclusive use will eliminate this benefit and reduce economic feasibility.*

BOR Response #3 - It is inaccurate to state that the VSP has a goal of "totally eliminating exclusive use sites." This issue is one of the areas that is being examined as part of the process. We have stated that a Common Condition in all alternatives will be the elimination of exclusive use sites from the 455 msl and below.

Your idea to remove the long-term dry sites and turn that into camping areas is not a bad idea. ... What exactly do you think campers do with their gray water? It is dumped directly onto the ground or into the lake. This happens at every campsite around the lake every day. The dry sites have tanks to dump gray water into; this will not happen with campers. I have personally seen campers urinating on the trees and bushes in our resort. ... To make room for more campers, choose an area of a resort, relocate as many of the current long-time users to another area, and develop that area for campsites. We have a few areas of Spanish Flat that would be very suitable for this. The area below Quail Hill on the lakeside would be a perfect area for campers.

Why not allow some trailer owners to stay (with strict guidelines) to ensure a cleaner, more orderly atmosphere? It won't be much of an 'improvement' in recreation if all that's left are vandals, beer-drinkers, and brawlers.

If mobiles are to be moved, persons on the lake need to know soon so they don't keep worrying about it.

What is the difference between the waste water of long-term trailer owners and short-term campers?

Our family has enjoyed the use of Lake Berryessa for over 45 years at the Rancho Monticello Resort. Our children are 3rd generation in our family to enjoy the lake. We feel there is room for day use and trailer sites and that we all have the right to enjoy the lake. The lake should be preserved for the enjoyment of everyone, and those of us who do so at a trailer site should be given the opportunity to continue to do so.

We are concerned as to whether or not our investment in our trailer and site is worthless. What is going to happen in 2008? Selling is impossible, and many people have a lot invested in their trailers and sites.

***Steele Park Resort was a planned mobile home development by Napa County and all improvements – retaining walls, decks, etc. – were done by permit. ... As a long-term permittee in Steele Park, I know it was a planned development and the county, state, and federal government consented to development of the mobile homes in the park. ... Permittees were made a promise by the county and the federal government that they would not be removed.*

***Our long-term sites most certainly were part of a formal development plan by Napa County, as administered by an agreement signed in 1958 with BOR.*

BOR Response #4 - (To both comments) As identified in other documents and during earlier meetings, BOR is not aware of any written plans or other documents that outline a specific direction for the development of "mobile home parks" at Steele Park or any other resort. If any permittees have such documents that identify long-term directions and give commitments or promises beyond the term of the current concession authorizations, they should provide a copy to BOR. Exhaustive efforts have been made as a part of the initial VSP work to identify all known applicable documentation as to how the resorts developed in the past and present manner. Although mobile home parks were permitted and have developed to their present configuration, there is no indication that they were formally planned or intended for any specific period of time.

There is no evidence that the public has been hampered by or is opposed to the existence of long-term homeowners. There has been no public call, separate from BOR, for the removal of the long-term homeowners simply because they represent exclusive use.

We believe all concessionaires and many supporting agencies agree that day users are “high maintenance” in clean-up, safety, maintaining a “family atmosphere,” law enforcement, and fire prevention and reporting. For this reason, day user areas should not be spread throughout Steele Park.

If you add more day-use and short-term facilities at the cost of eliminating long-term residents, any rational mind will conclude that the need for law enforcement personnel must increase at an exponential rate. Existing day-use and short-term facilities are more than adequate. Any increase will have catastrophic consequences.

***The U.S. Government and Napa County receive millions of dollars from the long-term tenants that help run the lake. And for the most part, long-term tenants treat the lake with the respect it deserves. ... I think the VSP has already paid dividends. There is a noticeable difference for the good around Rancho, both on the resort and tenant sides. Some of the old unsightly trailers have been or are scheduled to be destroyed, and individuals are cleaning up their sites.*

***Also to be taken into consideration is the hefty sum that the Government receives (that it would now lose) from mobile home owners of all the seven resorts. It must be in the millions per year.*

BOR Response #5 - The above comments regarding funds generated by long-term tenants that directly help BOR operate Lake Berryessa are inaccurate, but this position was stated by many respondents. We cannot speak for the county, but BOR does not receive any funds from long-term tenants that “help run the lake.” Tenants make monthly payments to the concessionaires, and those payments are approximately 60 percent of the total revenue taken in by concessionaires. All the resorts together generate approximately \$11 million annually or \$6.6 million from long-term tenants. The resorts pay a 3 percent franchise fee which goes directly into the General Treasury of the United States and does not go to assisting at the lake. The total annual franchise fees currently generated by long-term tenants is approximately \$200,000 ($\$6.6 \times .03 = \$198K$). However, neither the lack of direct funding to BOR nor any possibility to increase it will be a major factor in determining future alternatives.

If BOR is so concerned about serving the public, there is plenty of shoreline to develop besides the existing developed areas. What about my rights to enjoy my life at the lake? I pay taxes just like everyone else and BOR wants to take that away from me and every other mobile home owner at the lake. If campers are allowed in the mobile home area, then the risk factor for vandalism and theft will increase ten fold. Just this year my neighbor and I were sitting on a friend's deck when someone tried to steal his golf cart right in front of us.

The campers, who only seem to come on major holidays, tend to be a younger and wilder crowd than those who own. They come in for the weekends, party, and then leave their mess on the shores. They leave cans and bottles and plastic bags and garbage. When the lake rises, these are the items that end up in our lake. As owners, we are in a trailer with garbage cans and garbage pick up. We end up picking up the garbage left by the campers and dumping it in our own garbage cans. And again, the campers only come on the major holidays.

It would be a shame if BOR were to eliminate all of our existing trailers. Not only is it a huge loss of income for BOR, but also a huge loss for all of us who grew up enjoying our summer homes. Not only do we utilize the lake during the summer, but we also use the trailer year-round including during the winter when we want to get away for the weekend but don't want the burden of expensive hotels in touristy towns. ... Campers and day-use people tend to leave more garbage behind than those of us who own the trailers and pay a monthly rent. After every big holiday weekend, there is always more garbage in the lake and on the beach than any other average weekend. ... Keep in mind that there are a lot of families who not only enjoy their time at the lake but also create a very steady and healthy income for BOR.

When BOR took over control of Lake Berryessa in 1976 or so they made some changes, one of which was, as I understand it, that any mobile homes/trailers that were under 10X40 had to be removed. You can check into this because that laid the legal groundwork for my suggested plan. Mobile homes built after 1970 were 12 feet or wider, prior to that they were 10 feet wide. If in 2008 all mobile homes/trailers under 12 feet wide (give or take 2 or 3

inches) must be removed from all long-term use areas, this would thin out and in some cases remove all units in some areas. BOR could then set new spacing etc, for those vacated areas or change the use. Obviously all mobiles and trailers should be removed from dry sites. ... The 'all go plan' is not acceptable and I believe will not fly if you try to do that. You may not think the response has been big so far. Most residents are waiting to see what your initial draft is going to look like. Believe me, if BOR decides on the 'all go plan,' all hell will break loose. We are organizing as we speak. If this is your plan, we will flood BOR and Congressmen with letters, faxes, e-mail, and whatever else it takes. Don't think that we are only 1,500 people ... it would be 15,000 or more. ... Another plus to this plan is that the people with the later model mobiles have a large investment and keep their spaces well maintained. One reason is so future buyers can enjoy it, like they have. These people are the ones for the most part who will spearhead the organization to fight the removing of all mobiles. Without them fighting you, there would be little resistance. It's not that if they can stay, the hell with the rest of them. It's that they want a more beautiful Lake Berryessa as you do and some places are junk. This is in large part due to the lack of supervision by BOR in past years. It has been whatever the resorts wanted to do, that's what they did, whether it be permanent spaces on dry areas, lack of maintaining the resort, or enforcing rules on the permittees to maintain their spaces. ... The mobiles use a small percentage of the lakefront, so why do you want to remove them? There are many lakefront areas within the resorts that can be used for camping. Why is it that Oak Shores and Smittle Creek cannot be used for overnight? Could it be that BOR does not want to deal with it?

BOR policy seems to imply that long-term use is somehow elitist. Believe me that we recognize our good fortune in owning a mobile home at the lake. But we also recognize our responsibilities and are not opposed to reasonable increases in public access to this beautiful place. The benefits to the lake from long-term users is clear and have been and should continue to be acknowledged by BOR. Besides economic benefits, long-term users have a significant multiplier effect on the total number of people who have access to Lake Berryessa recreational opportunities. In my case, counting friends and relatives, I contribute at least 50 visits per year to the lake by people who would never have the experience because they would never choose to go there themselves. I know this is true of many of my Steele Park neighbors and others around the lake. ... We would question the destruction (which is what "removal" would be) of what we consider at least "grand fathered" property unless there were empirical proof that the use was incompatible with other goals. ... There are no areas of Steele Park, for example, except the dirt under the trailers, which are "excluded from other appropriate public recreational use/users." All areas of the shoreline are open to boaters. There are often boaters stopping on the shore of the cove where I have a mobile home. Fishermen are a constant and welcome sight trolling past my place. ... This shoreline is the same as the rest of Steele Park with multiple coves and relatively flat beaches. Many boat-in or hike-in campsites could be installed. This is just one of the many examples of being able to increase short-term use without removal of long-term sites. ... **BOR has made the elimination of long-term trailers a "common condition" in the VSP without even having formulated a draft of a plan for making the lake more publicly accessible for short-term use. As such, the removal of long-term environmentally-friendly tenants is unnecessary and unjustified. BOR should understand that attempts to do so will cause litigation and unnecessary delays in the implementation of the VSP. Conversely, BOR should realize that the present responsible tenants provide a strong base of support for the implementation of the best elements of a thoughtful VSP.

BOR Response #6 - BOR has not "made the elimination of long-term trailers a common condition in the VSP" as identified in the above comment. The common condition only referred to Dry Sites and to any trailer installations below 455 msl. These are for reasons of health, safety, and environmental protection. The remaining long-term trailers were not even addressed within the "common conditions."

Long-term sites were developed to provide resort operators a steady cash flow to help supply a consistent staff and resort operations that otherwise would result in a seasonal business. The planners knew it then and most know it now. Yes, changes need to be made. Please don't try to throw the baby out with the bath water!

How will your plan of eliminating long-term trailers address the support of local businesses during drought years? The general public will not come and support businesses as long-term tenants have during those years. What is the future commitment of Napa County, CHP, Sheriff, and the State of California?

I have spent time in the past few weeks cruising the shoreline checking out the existing resorts. Yes, they do need cleaned up. Maybe it would be possible to require that all current long-term lessees replace their trailers with

cabins or something similar so that there is some continuity. Allow them to rent out their places when they are not using them. Charge them a fee for doing so.

The Rappers visiting Oak Shores contributed to serious traffic hazards and created a nuisance. This is a prime example of what happens when you generate more open space for public use in an unsupervised atmosphere. If you removed all mobiles and allowed the public use, it will become very unsightly as it did during the drought years when the public had access to the lakeshore. Why eliminate long-term sites when they are generating the bulk of the revenue all year long for the concessionaires and BOR?

We hope that the Government will not “throw out the baby with the bath water” when it comes to a mixed use of public day use and public exclusive occupancy, as each of them has their own place. To open LB to day use would put a great strain on the infrastructure of the limited roads and police services as exemplified by the rap concerts that have taken place at Oak Shores. We as tenants are also public, and if we continue to maintain our sites at the resorts, we should be allowed to be part of the future. We respectfully suggest that a mixed public use is desirable, but if you think that more day use and camping is the way to go, I suggest that you go into the campsites at the resorts during a major holiday weekend and the days thereafter when the resort staff is cleaning up the chaos created by day users.

Long-term residents are the backbone of the economic success of all business at the lake. My space costs approx. \$13K a year for trailer site and boat slip rent and upkeep. I also pay taxes to Napa Co. I bring over 200 people per year to the lake that utilize local hotels and other retail areas.

Residents in Spanish Flat Resort who have trailers, private docks, and stairways within the 100 linear foot zone should not be required to vacate. It is unfair, disruptive, and against the spirit of goodwill.

BOR has greatly contributed to the decay and pollution of the lake. Bad management and poor communication between the resorts and BOR has caused all the problems. Mobile homes should be a part of the plan for 2008-2009 because BOR, Napa County, and the concessionaires will lose a lot of money if the mobiles are not present.

There is a difference between mobile homes and trailers. Mobile homes like our's show pride of ownership but many trailers on dry sites never should have been permitted. Mobile home owners provide the main economic support for the overall operation of all of the resorts, and they could never successfully make it without our year around payments.

I have been visiting the lake for over 20 years. I too believe the area needs to be revitalized. For the most part, the owners of 'exclusive long-term trailer sites' ARE the people who take pride in keeping the lake clean and safe. ... Personally I take offense to the term 'exclusive use.' You are right that the public isn't allowed to use our mobile home, but 20-30 families who might not otherwise visit Lake Berryessa, do. We and they are also the public. Please be kind in your decision to eliminate our 'family and friends gathering spot.'

In all the years I have been at Putah Creek it has been clean. ... In recent years, an effort has been made to improve the landscaping of the park. Isn't this a better option when it comes to the environment of the lake? I believe that the existing parks and their trailers should be allowed to remain as they are. I also believe that improvements by the park owners need to be made to follow the rules established by BOR.

I would like to see a future for the lake where our trailers and the parks can stay with improvements done. It makes more sense to fill a park full of trailer owners consistently paying rent 12 months a year than it does to build a motel that will only be full on the major summer holiday weekends and be a loss the rest of the year.

Keep the current sites, lots, etc. as they are. ... The mobile home owners support the parks with their monthly rental payments. Without those payments, the parks could not exist. ... Existence of mobile homes keep reasonable rates for the rest of public ... Provide needed stores ... Public use and concessionaires can coexist as they have been.

Some way to treat those of us who love Lake Berryessa and who love to spend recreational time there.

Use existing undeveloped areas for new public use rather than cut back on the existing concessionaires.

There is no reason to disrupt current concessionaires, residents, and tenants of the lake absent proof of detriment. Historic use has benefitted many, and there is little or no documented outcry for increased public access.

- < **Rehabilitation of lakeshore including the removal of poorly engineered and unapproved stabilization attempts.**
Many of the current retaining walls and the like not only prevent environmental damage but provide enhanced aesthetic value. We don't think that it would be in the best interests of the environment to remove those that meet building codes without a replacement plan.

The small amount of lakeshore stabilization has maintained those areas and should remain.

Redevelop the entire area to include mountain and lakeside cabins with private docks or boathouses. Or a private docking area for residents.

- < **Sub-concessionaires will not be permitted. All commercial activities will be conducted directly by concessionaires.**
***We would like an explanation and example of what this refers to. Would this include restaurants and stores that might be operated by individuals that lease the business opportunities from the primary concessionaires? If so, please describe what would be allowed under the proposed guidelines and the purpose of this proposal.*

***Does this mean no more ski groups, boat rentals, or other things conducted by subs?*

BOR Response #7 - (To both comments) Under current BOR Concession Management policy, it is preferred to not have sub-concession operations. In practice throughout the Country in both BOR and the National Park Service, the use of sub-concession operations has proven to be inferior to the direct management of public services by the concessionaires themselves. This does not mean that the services currently provided by subs will no longer be available. In fact, the new contracts will be much clearer in regards to exactly what the concessionaires need to provide. In the current situation, there are frequently times when food and beverage and other services are discontinued because the sub just did not work out. The new contracts will make it the direct responsibility of the concessionaire to hire appropriate employees to do the assigned work. Some examples of these activities are food and beverage service, water craft rental, waterskiing instruction, etc. We probably should have better explained this issue because several respondents outlined concerns.

- < **Informational and regulatory signing style in each concession area will be of a type compatible with the overall signing throughout the Lake Berryessa Recreation Area and of a common theme within individual concession properties.**

We are all for a common requirement in this area.

Making the concessionaires clean up the resorts, with uniform signage, not allowing foam docks etc. is a great idea. Make it happen.

There is inadequate signage approaching the lake from Napa or Winters. It would be nice to have directional and welcome signs at the gateways.

Common Conditions RE: Government Operations

- < **Trails - A better system of trails around the lake is a need for hiking, equestrian, and multiple use. The RAMP stipulates the development of 40 more miles of trails. Cooperate with surrounding land holders (other agencies, private individuals, etc.) to develop a variety (hiking, mountain biking, equestrian, etc.) of designated trails. Provide accessible trail opportunities where feasible. Eastside should follow existing Lake Berryessa Wildlife Management Plan (1997) and the RAMP. – See later section outlining comments on trails.**
- < **Visitor/Information Programs/Facilities – The CA Department of Fish and Game (DFG) is becoming a major land owner north of the lake. As a Region, we can offer a lot to the area, especially working together to develop multi-agency/joint services. For example, the development of a multi-agency visitor facility by BOR, BLM, the University of CA at Davis, DFG, and the Blue Ridge/Berryessa Natural Area Group. Even if other groups are unable to participate,**

BOR believes that any facility should provide basic information and assistance beyond just the immediate Lake Berryessa area managed by BOR.

Great! We assume that this information will also include requests for compliance to environmental restrictions (littering, feeding animals, etc.)

- < **Interpretive/Educational Programs - Development of a more consistent level of interpretation to enhance visitors' knowledge and education of natural and cultural resources at Lake Berryessa. This need could be initially developed on a seasonal basis.**

- < **Public Parking - Additional parking is needed in some areas to accommodate public use.**

We would hope that this would include additional traffic controls (specifically turn and merge lanes for entrance/exit from these areas) as it is a current safety hazard around such areas.

Provide parking outside the park with shuttle service. Perhaps loading and unloading parking can be available. I would like to see a more walker-friendly environment.

There are many roads leading to Lake Berryessa, all of which are two lanes, curvy, and very dangerous to drive. On holiday weekends, there have been many traffic accidents resulting in injury and death. Unless you plan to re-build and widen the traffic lanes, they cannot handle the traffic that your plan entails.

Common Conditions for Both Government and Concessionaire

- < **Additional or new development will not occur outside of the areas currently established and used for public support areas. This means that none of the concession land assignment areas will be expanded and no significant new Government facilities will be developed with the possible exception of boat launch and parking areas as earlier identified. Some acreage originally designated as part of a concession land assignment but undeveloped may be withdrawn from such assignment.**

While we agree with the second sentence in this item, we assume that the third sentence is in reference to the area that would be converted from the current dry sites and therefore voice our ... concern over eliminating dry sites.

Have you never been here on Memorial Day weekend? I thought this lake was for the enjoyment of the public?

No land should be withdrawn from concession areas.

- < **Trail development in previously undeveloped areas may occur by the Government. This VSP will address, in general, the development of additional trails but the environmental clearances will be done independently when specific routes are proposed.** – See later section outlining comments on trails.
- < **Dock flotation will not be permitted if it is unenclosed foam or other installation that results in break up and trashing the lake. This common condition will apply to the upgrades of currently existing facilities as well as new construction.**
Great! We have all seen the floating white debris during high water times and recognize that, for the most part, the world would be a better place if Styrofoam had never been invented.

Other Common Conditions

- < **The area now utilized by the Boy Scouts may no longer be retained for exclusive use. It is not in the best interest for contemporary public use to have this area set aside for the exclusive use and management of a single group (Boy Scouts). Flat, usable land is at a premium at the lake, and this area could support some quality visitor use activities and seems to lend itself to being further developed for group use activities. The intent is to provide more opportunity for public lake access. Boy Scout groups would be provided an equal opportunity to reserve the area.**
Our only question would be what other types of organizations would be allowed this use (i.e., would it only be for organizations or for general public group activity?).

The mailer mentions the area now utilized by the Boy Scouts. It is touted as premium, flat, usable land that could be used to support quality visitor use. Use it!

- < **Private waterskiing clubs or organizations may no longer be provided exclusive use of certain areas of the lake. Formal waterskiing activities and instruction, if permitted, will become a responsibility of a concessionaire, and for control and safety purposes, there may be assigned and restricted use areas.**

Our general position is that the lake is for everyone's use but different types of recreation demand different conditions. It may be in the best interest of the general public to restrict some uses to certain areas in order to assure a higher level of public safety. The Skiers Cove area seems to be the type of area that needs to be present.

LAKESHORE DEVELOPMENT - The lakeshore designation at a minimum will include all areas within 100 linear yards of 455 feet msl.

With the lake level seldom at 455', the designation of 455' msl and all areas within 100 linear yards is excessive. BOR is being unrealistic in stating that a minimum of 100 linear yards above the 455 msl mark must be cleared. This will effectively eliminate all of the resorts.

There should be more development along the shoreline.

Motels or cabins and added camping around the lake is not a good plan.

On one hand BOR talks about rehabilitating the lakeshore, and on the other BOR talks about creating multi-use trails, adding additional public parking, and maybe lodging. The fact that BOR wants to develop the lakeshore and maybe add cabins, motels, additional lodging, group camping facilities, and boat-in camping is extremely contradictory.

BOR should use an average lake level for planning for public use during the summer season. This figure would be much more meaningful in determining setbacks of building sites and new public sites. 455 msl is plainly overkill, and it will receive a lot of attention. What has been the monthly average elevation of Lake Berryessa's water level over the past 50 years? ... There is nothing here that is worthy of a nature trail. ... If birding sites are to be considered, they should be placed well away from the lake to sample the wildlife diversity of the original area. ... Hotels, motels, and simple cabins are presently on the lake and available for public rental and use. The drawback is that they are currently largely vacant during the winter season. ... How is BOR determining 'public needs'?

*** Statements have been made that all long-term trailers be removed from 455 msl then 100 linear yards inwards. (Please see BOR Response #6) If you change that to 456 msl, you change the recurrence of the flooding interval level from every 11,111 years at (455) to a whopping 16,667 years. Of course this is only using the 95 percent confidence level (Final EIS Record of Decision, Feb 1993, page 18, GPO 785-619/99083). Is this methodology in creating a flood plain area to protect our trailers from flooding every now and then, or possibly to create a solution for some other problem? This formula would eliminate 100 percent of all long-term trailers at Pleasure Cove and 90 percent of all trailers lake wide. If this is truly a flood plain area, then as per the BOR EIS of 1993, compensation must be made to trailer owners forced to be relocated or removed from the resort area.*

Questions:

What types of lakeshore development should be acceptable at the lake above 455 msl?

We don't feel there is a need for further development around the lake other than perhaps some public campgrounds (non-concessionaire). We also feel the current facilities should be allowed to remain as long as they are maintained and meet the general environmental, health, safety, and construction laws listed in the unconditional section.

Generally, the type that has taken place so far, as long as it meets compliance with applicable standards.

There should be more development along the shoreline (i.e., motels, cabins, and restaurants).

Motels should be built to provide non-camping visitors with a place to stay.

There are too many boats, jet skis, and people now. The lake is not made to handle more people. As it is, very few weekends go by where someone is not seriously injured or killed.

The resorts need to expand their courtesy docking facilities at their restaurant and store areas. More outdoor seating capacity needs to be made available at all the resorts' restaurants.

The recreational needs of the public can best be served in many ways including day use facilities, campgrounds, RV sites, cabins, and long-term trailer villages. Trailer villages should continue so long as they are in compliance with the applicable environmental, health and safety, and construction laws. We take exception to not being perceived as part of the general public and labeled as exclusive users. We just happen to be part of the public that has made a bigger investment in Lake Berryessa in order to spend more time. The opportunity to purchase a place at Berryessa is open to all members of the public.

Lakeshore development above 455 msl should continue to be the same as now.

Should there be significant development along the shoreline in concession areas and those other areas designated in the RAMP?

No.

Yes, as long as a balance is maintained between existing uses, new uses aimed at meeting more short-term uses, and generally accepted environmental standards.

Lakeshore development should be restricted to certain areas.

Should short-term uses such as RV parks, cabins, motels, camping, and general day-use be developed within concession areas?

No cabins or motels should be developed within concession areas.

During the fall, winter, and early spring, you can count on one hand the number of campers and even mobile tenants within the resorts. It does not seem like enough business to be considering expansion.

More camping around the lake is not a good plan. Campers wash their dishes and clothing in the lake. ... BOR does not have the funds to clean up after campers and day use folks. ... Long-term users do little to no damage to the environment. Campers and day-users do far more damage to the environment.

To the extent that adequate amounts of such are not already in place, it should be considered.

Increased fires - recently a camper decided he would have a campfire by setting the weeds on fire. Also this year, who started the huge fire on the west side of the lake? Campers, of course.

I would like to see the development of decent campgrounds.

Short-term uses should replace the current exclusive use situation. These use areas need to be better designed so that they do not have as much of an impact as the current uses.

Please make public campgrounds and trails a priority.

Should concession facilities such as marinas, restaurants, launch ramps, and other water-based recreation facilities remain and expand as needed and as appropriately planned?

Yes, including existing long-term, compliant, sewer-connected mobile home sites, such as at Steele Park.

More launching ramps such as Cappel Cove to launch a boat without having to pay fees.

Concession facilities such as marinas, restaurants, launch ramps, and other water-based recreation facilities should remain and expand as needed and as appropriately planned.

Even within concession areas, should lakeshore development be restricted to certain zones?

No.

Other comments on future shoreline activities or facilities?

Get rid of the long-term leases (concessions) - no more trailer parks, and open up camping facilities.

Why not allow people to keep their stabilized shoreline as long as they comply with BOR's direction on how to build? People have invested a lot of money in trying to improve their sites through stabilization.

BOR should perform shoreline mitigation to reduce erosion along various areas of shoreline.

My wish list would include the following: 1) Remove all dry site trailers - I feel that for the most part these tend to detract from the lake as well as impose environmental hazards on the lake; 2) Remove all trailers that have not been maintained and detract from the beauty of the lake; and 3) Ban the use of jet skis from the lake for environmental and safety factors. This past Memorial Day weekend ... I heard of one person being killed and three more that were sent to the hospital.

To minimize future user conflicts, BOR should provide/permit a PWC Safety Course and promote the "National Association of State Boating Law Administrator's Model Act for Personal Watercraft."

We would like to see the banning of 2-cycle motors such as wave runners and jet skis as they are very polluting to the air and water.

At Steele Park, the long-term permittees are in constant amazement at the violations of water craft users: high speeds in 5 mph zones regardless of swimmers in the water and other dangerous maneuvers. The staffing at the Sheriff's Office is insufficient to be stationed at all these zones, and the long-term permittees have taken the responsibility of attempting to slow down the traffic and report dangerous users; however, it's a full-time job and often shouts of "slow down" are ignored. There are also repeated violations in allowing underage children to drive jet skis ... BOR has done a poor job of posting buoys, and some method of ensuring boating/jet-skiing safety needs to be established.

The 1992 RAMP calls for a capacity of 3,000 boats/water craft on the lake. As of today there are only three toilets on the water during the peak season and none after. One may want to ask where boaters go to the bathroom? Or where they will go when day use is increased?

Foot trails and ramps leading to the open space and beach areas. It is hard to find access between the trailers in the trailer park areas. We feel like we have to cut through private property to access what should be public areas. It would also be nice to have wheelchair access to the water in some of these areas.

One way to provide more recreation would be to expand into horse, hiking, and biking trails. These are activities that would have a low-to-no impact on water traffic. Development of more short-term rental units such as cabins, motels, campsites, and even floating cabins/campsites could be used by the above mentioned added activities both pre- and post-peak season. Lake Berryessa could become the new attraction for not only the hikers, bikers, and horse lovers, but also for bird watchers and off-season vacationers who prefer a quieter time in a beautiful area of the Napa Valley. Overnight lodging at the lake could even be promoted to Napa Valley wine tourists. I know this may sound out there, but between Jan-Feb, the lake hillsides drop down to around 25 degrees which is cold enough for several weeks of a man-made ski slope. I feel that any more development of water-related activities could have long-term hazardous effects on the bird and fish population as well as effects to our wild boar, turkeys, and other misc. wildlife populations. Not to mention the effects to humans.

***It is my opinion that before anything new should be considered, what is here now needs to be developed to its full potential. The resorts should be full-service resorts, including motels and full marinas with dockside sales of gas and boating supplies. They should all have food and beverage, groceries, related retail, etc.; however, this can only be achieved if the owners are offered long-term leases and BOR should offer low interest loans to resort owners.*

BOR Response #8 - BOR is not authorized to provide loans for business purposes. Businesses at Lake Berryessa must operate within the same parameters of feasibility as those throughout the country. As part of the VSP, BOR will contract with a qualified entity to conduct economic feasibility on any proposed alternatives.

Any ideas that greatly increase the number of people who have access to the lake may be detrimental to the lake itself. Adding more people and more recreation areas to a lake that is already congested will only have a negative effect.

We believe concessionaires don't have the right to fence the property to keep fishermen from walking down to the lake. We also do not like the fact that Skiers Cove is a closed area. It is public land. I understand that the ski area near Steele Park is for lessons, but they are plain rude over at Skiers Cove. ... We are very happy that the ghetto properties without hookups will be removed. At our location we have a 5th Wheel. I understand that it was the original intention for people to have trailers, not shoddy make-shift expansions to trailers. Maybe you should have specific regulations on what people can do (i.e., permanent additions would not be allowed or something appropriate).

If new public areas are developed, how would law enforcement, garbage pick-up, sewage disposal, and road maintenance be provided?

I can't begin to tell you how much garbage I have picked up while walking through our resort. The personnel do the best they can but usually wait until the campers have gone home on Sundays. I walk through the camping areas during the weekends while the campers just stand and look at me. Most of them do not love and care for the lake as the full-timers do. We are constantly stopping our boat and picking up trash from the lake. People who just come up for the weekends don't!! I hope when the environmental study is done, they take this into consideration.

Need trash cans on the shore during busy season.

Two very serious problems that I feel must be addressed at once are the appalling condition of the floating rest rooms and the huge amount of trash left at the lake each weekend. My wife and I have made two trips out on the lake this week and have picked up over 50 pounds of trash. Last year we picked up and disposed of at least 500 pounds, all at our own expense. You can see why I am cautious of encouraging more people to make use of the lake as many of them seem to think it is a convenient dump. The lake is my home, and it infuriates me to see how poorly visitors and the resorts treat it.

We like the fact that you have floating restrooms, but there could be more.

More or larger restrooms with more shower stalls and better functioning toilets.

Development at the lake will have no positive effect on those currently using the lake.

Perhaps water on a paid timer would help free up the showers and keep kids from playing in there.

The current concessions meet most of the lake requirements and there is no need for commercialized lodging or additional refreshment outlets. The retail businesses around the lake don't seem to do very well, and many of them have failed on more than one occasion. While it would be nice to have year-around restaurants available, if it is not economically feasible, nobody can make that work. The marinas should all be modeled after Berryessa Marina with gas, store, and food all conveniently located close to each other with courtesy docks for their customers.

Semi-permanent lake-front tenants should be allowed to remain. These areas are generally unusable as a beach or boat-in area. Ample room exists between the flood zone and lake to accomplish lake-front trails.

Upgrade and continue the concessions. Do not expand. If public access is improved, this would best serve the existing public and concessionaires. Too many concession contracts and services will negatively impact the concessionaires that currently do business in our area.

TRAILS

Questions:

Should-multi use trails be the standard or should BOR designate some trails or parts thereof as specific use types (i.e., hiking, biking, equestrian, etc.)?

Wonderful. These trails will need to be patrolled by Rangers for compliance with safety rules and regulations as well as environmental and litter protection. Without such support, the environment would be best left untouched.

BOR does not have enough money or manpower to keep the area under their control at present time let alone clean

up along a trail. People come to the lake because of the water; I've never heard anyone say they wish there was a trail.

I have been going to Lake Berryessa for 20 years and have not met anyone who has hiked the surrounding area of the lake. There is not that large of a demand for trails.

Surrounding landholders are not in favor of your proposed plan especially when they do not know where these specific sites or trails will be located. ... How will sewage, trash, and erosion be handled? ... BOR does not have enough maintenance men to clean their own grounds.

Additional trails and access would be good for the public, but a 165-mile trail circling the lake sounds extreme.

The idea of a trail all the way around the lake sounds great. The trails could be for hiking and bicycling but nothing noisy like motor bikes.

We feel that all trails should be multi-use, but we would see the need for patrolling the public trails to be sure that users are in compliance with all safety and environmental requirements.

Walking trails with no bikes or horses should be established between the resorts, but no trails should be built in wilderness areas on the East side of the lake. No boat access trailheads should be built anywhere. If trails are between resorts, parking can be built in areas already impacted by man.

Personally I am not a hiker, but trails for specific use would be an enhancement to the lake.

I think multi-use trails should be the standard, unless there are ways that the excluded uses can still have trails that allow for a continuous connection of trails throughout the region. For example, if mountain bikes are not allowed along the shoreline trail, then they should be allowed in trails higher above the lake. Otherwise, so long as the use is non-motorized, it should be ok. Exceptions would be areas where a type of use may cause erosion or other environmental issues. Hikers should be allowed on all the trails.

Where should trails and trailheads (to accommodate parking, etc.) be developed?

Specific-use types of trails should be developed with trails and trailheads along the highway off of the lake.

At various areas with trailheads leading to the resorts and other public facilities.

The public access areas to the lake along the west shore are adequate in terms of parking, but have no developed trail systems or other attractions. A trail system connecting the resorts and access areas should be developed.

Trailheads should be located at existing parking areas within the existing resorts. They should be developed at existing public access areas such as Oak Shores, Smittle Creek, and other public access areas. The Scout Camp should include a trailhead as should the parking area at Berryessa/Knoxville and Pope Canyon Road.

A trailhead and trails should be developed at the Boy Scout Camp.

Trails should be developed in the following locations: 1) A shoreline trail around the lake within BOR lands; 2) 'The Barton Hill Trail' could start at the Scout Camp, head along the shoreline on BOR lands, up the Dyer Creek drainage onto BLM lands, and loop back to the Scout Camp. It would be about 4 miles long and would be suitable for multiple use; 3) Trails on BLM lands up the Putah Creek drainage - this includes completion of the Pope Creek to Putah Creek trail as well as the next phases of the loop trails on the same parcels of public land; 4) A shoreline trail to Cedar Roughts; 5) A trail up to the 9,000-acre Berryessa Peak public lands. This will require purchase of private land to allow public access to the public lands on Berryessa Peak. 6) A 'high road' trail, now known as the Peaks Trail. This would encircle the lake along the ridges above the lake. This trail would include parts of the proposed Blue Ridge Trail from Monticello Dam to Cache Creek.

Should boating access trailheads be developed? Where?

Boating access trailheads should absolutely be developed. I am currently developing a boat-in trailhead along the Putah Creek arm of the lake. This trail, known as the Pope Creek to Putah Creek Trail (a.k.a. Walter Springs Trail), will allow boat-in hiking access to BLM public lands along the lake. This trail should be promoted as a possibility in the VSP to allow it to receive official recognition as part of an official boat-in trail network.

Sure, if docks are provided. At various locations.

Boating access trailheads should first be developed at existing public lands along the lake. Cedar Roughs is an example of an area where a boat-in trailhead would provide access to lands that currently have no official trailheads.

Boat-in access could be directly across from the Pope Creek to Putah Creek Trail on the BLM Barton Hill public lands located adjacent to the Boy Scout Camp. These public lands need boat-in trails in conjunction with a trail leading from the Scout Camp.

Should interpretive nature trails be developed on the east shoreline?

We think it would be great if there were public access to the eastern shore for those that would enjoy nature and protect the natural environment. If access were granted, we feel that it would have to be patrolled in some fashion.

Yes, interpretive nature trails should be developed on the eastern shoreline.

Leave the East side in its natural state with no shore access allowed or nature trails.

Consider opening the east side of the lake to the public for hiking. Is the road on the east side a public right of way?

It would be nice to have some nature trails along the eastern shoreline. The area of the eastern shoreline closer to Monticello Dam, near Portuguese Canyon, would be most suitable for a nature trail. The area along the east side road is fairly hot and flat, and would be least suitable for a trail.

Other comments on future trail facilities?

Trail development should be given a low priority, although it is a Preferred Action of the RAMP.

With so much shoreline, a trip might include the need for overnight stay. There would then be a need for approved camping areas and the required discipline/responsibility that goes along with that activity. This is low altitude foothill country and the fire dangers can be absolutely deadly, so if permitted, this should be a concern.

Multi-use trails are a great idea, but how do you plan on constructing and maintaining them? The only general public here are the long-term tenants, except for Memorial Day, Labor Day, and the 4th of July. As for a trail around the entire lake, I am not sure what purpose this would serve as backpackers do not come to Berryessa.

We need more maintained trails. I would like to see more nature walks more varied types of trails.

The addition of trails, especially one following the total shoreline of the lake, opens the door to transient populations flooding a huge area with added demands for fire fighting, trail maintenance, and police.

The eastern shore should be left inaccessible.

Build a footpath around the entire water's edge with occasional beach access.

The development of walking and biking trails sounds great; just make sure the trails are well-marked and you have restroom facilities well marked along the way. You must have a place for people to use the bathroom and throw away trash or they will destroy the environment.

Parking for trail use will need to be added and would need to be addressed in the EIS.

It would be nice to have a joint BLM, BOR, and public planning effort for regional trails around the lake. Public access to BLM public lands on Berryessa Peak should be a priority for such a regional plan. The Berryessa Peak public lands are 9,000 acres of inaccessible public lands on the Blue Ridge east of the lake.

Multi-use trails, with an exclusion of motor-powered vehicles, should be approved.

Trails should not have exclusivity of use but should be multi-use with signs and handouts spelling out restrictions and use guidance, and there should be some means of enforcement for this joint-use. If later a particular use impacts the quiet enjoyment of others, then BOR will need to make a decision for limiting use of these facilities by the offenders.

I would like to propose that BOR include in the VSP the development of a hiking trail around Lake Berryessa's shoreline, including a few miles of trails on which people could hike with their dogs off-leash.

A shoreline trail around the lake would allow outdoor enthusiasts without boats a way to enjoy the lake, particularly in the spring, fall, and winter when temperatures are more conducive to hiking and there are few visitors to the lake. It would also open up miles of shoreline which, due to the lack of trails, are currently inaccessible to the public.

There are insufficient hiking trails at the lake. For a public reservoir of its size, the lake is under-provided with trails.

DAY USE- Day use encompasses picnicking, swimming, beach use, and fishing.

Questions:

Is current access sufficient?

Since in the summer all of the access to these areas are full, it seems that there may be a need for additional areas.

Current facilities seem fine at this time. When I tour the Day Use area and Putah Creek bridge area in mid-week, I see lots of garbage in the areas. We should not have more if we can not take care of what we have.

The current day use facilities are adequate except on the holiday weekends.

There is plenty of room on the lake to handle some additional day use facilities for the three holidays annually that there is a shortage of campsites. The rest of the year there is no shortage. There is plenty of room for the day campers and the long-term mobile homes to co-exist.

Probably not, should develop more at the several locations that already have it and possibly at the resorts too, as long as it doesn't impact the folks who own mobile homes in the parks.

I believe that the resorts are all OK, but some of their property should be used for public access for day use with designated swimming areas.

We believe that there should be more access to the lake and more camping.

I believe that public access to the lake is adequate for the need.

I would like to see a lot more public access to the lake without being required to go through a resort. I have a home in Berryessa Highlands and cannot get to the lake that is so close to my home without going through Steele Park.

Free entrance to the resorts to use their facilities such as restaurants, stores, etc.

Public access to the water for residents of the county adjacent to the lake is inadequate and inconvenient.

Are current facilities sufficient?

I feel the facilities, such as restrooms and picnic areas, are sufficient and of high quality.

Some probably need updating and replacement.

There should be better parking for vehicles and boat trailers.

The VSP seems to define day use as non-boat use (picnicking, swimming, beach use, and fishing); therefore, I believe present facilities are sufficient, although additional facilities at the north end of the lake would be reasonable.

Should current federally managed day use areas (Oak Shores, Cappel Cove) be managed by a concession? Even though these areas are presently free, they may become fee areas even if staying under government management.

The currently federally-managed day-use areas should be managed by a concession only so long as the main reasons for going to the public access areas are not diminished. These reasons include the open spaces, lack of buildings, and access to the shoreline. These day-use areas could be managed by concessions but should not have retail components like the resorts have. These are recreation areas, not shopping areas.

Some free or subsidized areas should be available to the general public and could be managed by concession, but they would have to rely on subsidies from the federal government.

Other comments on future day use activities or facilities?

Some public beach area that is maintained instead of simply docking a boat somewhere and hoping it's not too muddy.

The people that do not use the lake on a regular basis come to the lake to have fun and have no regard for regulations or the dangers associated with drinking and water activities.

I have been around and seen the big mess left by day users under Putah Creek Bridge and Pope Bridge, at Smittle Creek and Oak Shores, especially following big holidays. ... The lake is clean, the water is clear, and if kept outside the reach of the boisterous, wild and drunken gangs, will continue to remain one of the best lakes in our beautiful state.

In the past when the water was low and campers were permitted to use the receding shoreline, it has been evident exactly how poorly they care for the area. They did not use provided porta-potties or garbage cans and just came to party and drink. Trailer owners spent hours every day picking up litter. Is this what you want?

How many more areas are needed for use? Memorial weekend, 4th of July, and Labor Day are the busiest times. Summer weekends see quite a bit of activity; the rest of the year, there is very little going on up there.

Why wipe out and lose so many people (and money) on the chance that 'build it and they will come.' Why not expand the existing areas of the lake such as the Boy Scout Camp and the existing day use areas? Why not add boat launches at the day use areas, and then they should have parking for the vehicle and trailer. These are the areas most crowded on the busy weekends. (Have you gone by there yourself and seen what kind of mess is left?).

The mobile home park with loops labeled 1-9 or some number where the Monticello Ski Club meetings are held would better serve the public if it was converted back to day-use/short-term use camping where mobile trailers and campers could stay the weekend. What you have now is a party zone that is destroying the environment and promoting unsupervised wild behavior. It looks like a slum.

Large day/picnic use area to accommodate large groups with lots of grassy area. Perhaps a volleyball net, basketball courts, horse shoes, bocce ball, or maybe a nine-hole golf course or putting green.

There is a large lakeshore area past the Putah Creek Bridge that is virtually unused by the public. Why not some improved day use or camping areas there? Or the Eastside. I have not seen proof that the areas we have open to the public are taken care of properly already. The garbage cans are overflowing, bottles and cans are in the water, and graffiti is everywhere. Why put in more areas that can be littered and defaced by users? Will you hire more employees to keep these areas clean and safe?

It has been our experience that the day users and campers are the troublemakers. They vandalize the bathrooms, play loud music at all hours, prowl around at night, and leave their garbage on the shores.

Current day-use facilities and access are sufficient and should remain under Government management.

Public facilities should be on the west side and be managed by the Federal Government as a fee area. There should be more of them, and they should include launching, shade, restrooms, water, trailheads, and picnic areas.

BOAT-IN CAMPING

Questions:

Should boat-in camping be considered for development at Lake Berryessa?

The east shore would be a great area for boat-in camping, given concerns over fire and environmental issues. This has not worked in the past and campers leave litter and go to the bathroom wherever is convenient and not in restrooms.

Boat-access camping would be welcomed by the boating public. It should be given a high priority and it should be developed to the maximum extent possible. At least 100 sites should be considered as a beginning, as recommended by Preferred Action #8 of the RAMP.

My main concern is that if it is, there needs to be careful attention to the potential fire hazards. Recently saw some unauthorized camping that resulted in a fire and am concerned that allowing it will increase fire danger.

Boat-in camping would be a disaster. It was tried years ago and one of the islands caught fire and the same would happen again with the level of enforcement available.

I would develop some boat-in camping. Several people I've talked to enjoy it. What is the experience at Lake Sonoma which has several sites?

No boat camping should be allowed. This could impact undeveloped areas and would be an additional fire hazard.

Where should boat-in opportunities be developed?

Boat-in opportunities should be developed at the existing Scout Camp and long the tip of the Wragg Ridge Peninsula.

Maybe out on the islands..

Should the naturalness of the islands be maintained?

Boat-in camping should not be considered for development at Lake Berryessa. The naturalness of the islands should be maintained.

I don't really care. I think it is a good location to take advantage of for some of the public facilities and should probably be considered for that especially boat-in camping as long as fire danger can be mitigated.

Boat-in camping should be considered for development at the lake, but for shoreline locations, not for the islands.

Do not change the present use of the islands.

Can this type of program be managed appropriately in an environmentally sound manner with the proper handling of sewage and solid waste?

The concern I have with boat camping is the potential for increased pollution to this drinking-water lake and the fact that most persons using the lake would not be prepared for overnight stays either on the snake-infested islands nor on their boats, drifting into traffic areas.

Would the public be willing to pay the premium to assure proper care if boat-in-camping is established?

If sufficient law enforcement can be provided in the future, some remote boat-in camping would be desirable in areas

where it would not interfere with other resource values.

Who should manage these facilities, the Government or concessionaires?

Government.

Either would be fine, but maybe it would be better from a fire danger standpoint if the feds do it.

What facilities would be needed on island and on shore (i.e., restrooms, docks, campsites, parking, garbage receptacles and pick up, etc.)?

Other comments on the future of boat-in-camping activities or facilities?

The naturalness of the islands should absolutely be maintained! The big and small islands are very special places that have fabulous blue oak woodlands, deer, and native bunch grasses and wildflowers. The islands should be preserved as wildlife areas, with no development. No boat-in facilities, trails, or other development should occur on the islands. It should be noted that islands on lakes are very rare in California.

Once developed facilities occur on islands, the herds of deer will no longer find the islands suitable for habitat. When I go out to the islands, I make sure to stay as far from the deer as possible. They are easily spooked, and if more than one small group of people is on the island, they would be forced to swim to the mainland.

Sewage and solid waste are not the only concerns about developing facilities on islands. Additional trash from camping would develop on the islands. The current use of the island as a boat-in, cross-country hiking area for non-motorized users will prevent large numbers from going onto the island. This will still allow for public access, but will limit the numbers and keep the islands in a more pristine state.

The islands should have no facilities. On shore, boat-in areas should be simple. If the islands are hiking destinations, there should be little more than a trailhead sign and possibly a small dock. Shoreline areas used for camping should have a small dock, restrooms, possibly showers, and defined camping spots. Those camping spots should have fire rings, a picnic table, and a BBQ pit.

GROUP CAMPING - These questions refer to the area known as the Boy Scout Camp west of Putah Creek Resort. As identified under Common Conditions this area may no longer be assigned for the primary use of the Boy Scouts.

Questions:

Should group campsites (of varying capacities) be developed?

Group camping is already available at most resorts and if more room is needed use Acorn Beach (Oak Shores). ... The scouts should be able to keep their site because they keep it clean and we need to support them because they help raise our young people to become adults.

We would love to see public camping available at some location on the lake. If there was group camping as well, that would probably be a plus.

The Boy Scouts should have first choice over this area.

Both group campsites and individual campsites should be developed at the current Boy Scout Camp. They should be managed by the Government. Trails and a trailhead should be developed from this location.

Group sites should be built at the Boy Scouts' site.

Should individual (traditional campground) campsites be developed at this location?

Individual campsites should be developed at the Boy Scout Camp. Tent camping along one of the quieter arms of the lake would be a fabulous experience. If the Barton Hill Trail were developed, it would be a great place to camp/hike.

There is, sadly, no public camping at Lake Berryessa. The lake is the largest publically-owned body of water of its kind without public camping. There is a significant need for primitive and tent camping at the lake in a vicinity where natural amenities predominate, rather than noise, boat congestion, and trailers.

Who should manage the facilities developed, the Government or concessionaires? Neither alternative will provide free use.

Government.

It really doesn't matter who manages the facilities at the Boy Scout Camp as long as the it is managed well, is fairly primitive, and is without so many services that the experience of camping is overshadowed by a 'resort feel.'

Should a trailhead and trails be developed from this location?

What facilities would need to be developed (i.e., restrooms, water, campsites, shade shelters/pavilions, BBQ pits, etc.)?

Other comments on this area's future use?

Any large group (over 100 or so) gatherings should require permits.

Sure, group campsites of varying capacities should be developed - so long as such areas are supervised. Group camps are great places for large groups to have events. A camp host would be necessary to ensure safety.

Facilities needed to be developed at the current Boy Scout Camp would be a parking area, entry signs, showers, restrooms, group campsites, and individual campsites. That should be the extent of the facilities. I would avoid placing any retail establishments at this location.

ZONING

Questions:

Should certain areas of the lake be zoned to prohibit some types of usage (i.e., water skiing, houseboating, motorized boating, fishing, swimming, etc.)? Provide examples and locations.

Given the wide variety of water activities, some are not compatible and should have their own exclusive areas. Non-motorized boating and swimming should be close to easy road access such as the current 5mph and swimming area along the west shore. There are too many violations of this 5mph restriction that make the current situation hazardous at times. Slalom skiing requires its own area and should be used for that purpose only; Skiers Cove works great for this activity. Fishermen need to be aware of the dangers or potential conflicts in some of these special use areas.

There is so little policing available on the lake now that zoning would not be able to be enforced.

There is a need for more swimming areas.

The water area bounded by the Big Island and the Small Island should remain a restricted speed zone of 5mph. ... Jet skis should not be singled out for special restrictions.

I think many people would like to see certain areas off limits to PWC; however, this should be limited as everyone should have the chance to enjoy that type of equipment in most locations. Yet near resorts and other areas with greater traffic, there should be some restrictions.

Zoning for specific use would be beneficial in selected areas; i.e., areas behind both bridges should be 5mph zones.

Swimming areas and 5mph zoning are good enough.

As a paddler of non-powered boats, I suggest that some areas of the lake be zoned for non-motorized boating, or if that is impossible, larger areas (such as Putah Creek Arm) should be zoned for 5mph limits.

Provide safe area for swimming, canoeing, and maybe paddle boats.

Except for designated swimming areas, please do not zone the lake for specific uses. The lake should be available to all users, not the few. Leave the lake use as is; it seems to work very well, except for access facilities.

Appropriate areas should have restricted use; i.e., coves, islands, and East side of the lake.

Certain areas should be off-limits to motorboat use. While the main area of the lake would be open to motorboat use, certain areas should be closed. For example, the area between the shoreline and the big and small islands should be open for non-motorized use. Kayakers would love to have an area where they do not have to worry about being hit. Also, the narrows area between Wragg Ridge Peninsula and Monticello Dam should be open to kayaks and human-powered boats, and possibly electric trolling motors, only.

Other comments on future zoning needs?

Eliminate jet skis from the lake. Unlike seadoos and wave runners, they are extremely loud and emit noxious fumes.

Jet skiing should be prohibited or limited to certain areas as other lakes have done. Areas around the islands or the eastern side outside the narrows could be used for jet skiing. ... The sheriffs' office is understaffed and BOR is also There is not sufficient lake patrol.

WATERSKIING

Questions:

Should exclusive areas for waterskiing instruction and/or events continue to be permitted and set aside?

Private waterskiing areas should remain.

***Why does your proposal eliminate exclusive use for slalom skiing on the one hand, yet propose limited use areas for other, similar, recreational use?*

BOR Response #9 - The Bulletin (not proposal) did not say that slalom skiing would be eliminated; furthermore, it did not say that areas set aside for special waterskiing activities would be eliminated. The Bulletin just asked questions regarding those activities. Perhaps we should have been clearer in explaining the concerns or potential problems with this issue because it elicited many concerned responses. BOR believes that waterskiing activities at Lake Berryessa are very appropriate and should continue. It is also likely that certain areas should continue to be set aside for the safe and appropriate conduct of instruction and special events. However, the VSP will examine whether these activities should continue under the auspices of a private club. We recognize that the club does not exclude any interested parties from joining, but we will examine whether the same services could be more efficiently provided by a concessionaire as a part of their required services. One of the problems with private clubs is that it introduces a situation where any other outside private entity or club that would like a similar special authorization could create problems that would result in worse overall service to the public, whereas concessionaires have certain types of exclusive authorizations which can be protected and their level of service monitored. Single-day events or one-time authorizations, even on an annual basis, do not present the potential problems from an agency management standpoint as do the permanent groups; i.e., ski clubs that are assigned exclusive use of certain lake areas. The issue of long-term clubs and organizations who want special authorizations will be reviewed as part of the VSP.

Since the lake has few well-protected areas good for waterskiing, it seems reasonable that one should be set aside for any formal activities; i.e., jumping instruction, slalom, and contests.

BOR has always told people these areas were open to everyone but have not enforced this rule.

I think these areas should be allowed as long as some provision is made for access to them by the general public, even if there are some fees required for that. But make a provision that they must be shared with others at some times.

Yes, exclusive areas for waterskiing instruction/events should continue to be permitted and set aside.

Non-profit waterskiing clubs should be allowed to continue; they have been a part of the lake since it was built. They allow, and should continue to allow, public use for a fee to cover their costs. They have minimal impacts on the lake and only restrict boating that is a hazard to their activity. Ski schools also should continue for the same reasons. Both should comply with reasonable guidelines since they are one of the most appropriate recreation uses for the lake.

Exclusive areas for waterskiing instruction/events should continue to be permitted as long as it is on the main area of the lake and clearly designed.

Please continue to allow the waterskiing club to operate in its current location. It actually attracts a more knowledgeable safer boater. It is one of the only places a skier can get the mental and physical challenge of a course in a beautiful environment.

Please let Willie continue to operate his waterski instruction. It brings a knowledgeable skier that is willing to learn.

Other comments on future waterskiing activities or facilities?

Would like to have waterskiing facilities such as the slalom course and school at a reasonable cost and open to all.

As an alternative, consider developing some public slalom courses.

Skiers Cove should continue to be zoned for controlled and not open skiing. The ski course affords those who are serious skiers the opportunity to ski in safe conditions. It should be promoted along with all LB water sports.

Waterski organizations that provide support on a non-profit basis should not be eliminated in favor of concessionaires.

Perhaps putting a portable toilet on the lake at the entrance to the cove of the club would slow traffic and create an even safer environment.

Future waterskiing facilities would also be great. More places where children and adults could learn safe responsible boating and skiing would be great.

COMMERCIAL HOUSEBOATING

Questions:

At present there are no full-service commercial houseboat rental operations on the lake. Should such an operation be authorized to provide similar services as are currently available in areas such as Lake Shasta, Lake Oroville, New Melones, McClure Reservoir, etc.?

Yes, a commercial houseboating operation should be authorized.

Houseboats at the lake have never been successful because of inexperienced operators and high winds.

Houseboat rentals at the lake have never been successful. It is not as well suited for Lake Berryessa as it is for Shasta and Lake Powell because it does not offer the remote locations favored by houseboaters.

There should be some but not many.

Absolutely, subject to some limit on their number.

Commercial houseboat rentals, if limited, would be a benefit.

Lake Berryessa is not Lake Shasta. I've boated on Lake Shasta, and it's a great experience. But I wouldn't do it on Berryessa – it's too small. Patio boat rentals make more sense.

Other comments on future houseboating activities or facilities?

If you allow full-service houseboats, be prepared to increase your management of the lake. It would seem that the lakes' size is not large enough to handle the additional large vessels nor does it have the mooring required and again we are talking about overnight stays, which increase pollution.

We do not believe that jet skis or houseboats should be rented to anyone without instruction for operation and safety.

We wonder why some resorts have banned houseboats? We invite you to sit on our decks on any weekend to watch the horrific show...

Houseboating should not be allowed unless the vendor is inspected for compliance; restrict them from the East side.

While the lake is large, I feel that houseboats may have the potential to shift the mobile home problem we currently have on the shoreline onto the lake itself. There would also be concern about moving the houseboats up to the lake on such narrow roads. It would be best to have the narrow portions of the lake open for non-powered, and the large portions opened for powered use, with an emphasis on day-use only for lake-based recreation.

FOOD AND BEVERAGE OPERATIONS

Questions:

What types of food and beverage outlets should be associated with the following facilities (options would include full service dining, fast food/deli, grocery, vending): For hotels/motels/cabins? Marinas? Campgrounds/RV Parks?

*Nice
restau
rant
with
inside
and
terrac
e
dining
.*

All of the above are fine.

Each area needs some nice, clean, and updated services, and it would be nice for all overnights and for the mobile homeowners and their guests also.

Full-service dining and fast food around the lake would be great.

Over the last 30 years, only the fast food format has been successful at the lake. It does not require skilled restaurant employees, and is a high profit operation. ... Full-service dining, although desirable, suffers because it is not possible to keep a restaurant open all year and has high turnover and problems with food quality and inconsistent service.

Both ends of the lake have full-service dining, Steele Park and Putah Creek. It would be nice to have another nice restaurant mid-lake.

Snack Bar and Ice Cream Parlor.

Other comments on future food and beverage needs?

Current food and beverage operations should be left 'as is.'

Food and Beverage Operations, Lodging, and Retail Outlets: I believe these are all sufficient, especially if you desire a rustic experience in which you are self-sufficient with what you brought from the city.

These operations are appropriate and should be increased as necessary.

LODGING

Questions:

What types of lodging facilities would you want to see at the lake: Hotels including some support facilities for meetings? Motels? Cabins?

Large rustic lodge with overnight accommodations. Perhaps with rustic lakeside cabanas.

If there was a need for lodging in the Berryessa area other than camping, motor homes, and trailers, the business entrepreneurs would have been making inroads to build hotels, motels, etc.

Motels that are rented at a reasonable rate and are clean would be an asset to the lake, as would additional cabins.

A clean motel and a few more cabins would be nice. Putah Creek does not have a restaurant with their motel and Steele Park is too pricey.

The most promising alternative is the use of prefabricated cabins.

Both hotels/motels and cabins should be developed as long as they are not on the lake and are affordable.

Although Steele Park has a motel, it is always full during the summer months. Another motel/housekeeping cabins at the north end of the lake would be beneficial.

Lodging facilities are appropriate at the lake and should be increased as necessary.

There should be a limited number of hotels. Perhaps like in National Parks, there could be only one hotel at the lake. It could offer lodging and meeting areas. In addition, a single motel could provide cheaper rooms and an alternative to the lake hotel. Cabins should also be provided at the lake as an alternative to the current mobile home situation.

Motels and cabins to rent would be OK. Some people want to enjoy the lake but do not enjoy camping.

Other comments on future lodging needs?

It is very doubtful that any large hotel or restaurant would be able to succeed in this area.

Steele Park is already a model for what BOR wants: we have RV parks, cabins, motels, and general day use. There is even room to build an additional motel as well as increase areas for camping.

You want to put up a hotel, etc. ... I have been in the travel business for years and you are not being at all realistic with this idea. Also, how are you going to handle the traffic, where is the law enforcement going to come from, what about the sewer system handling all these multi-tasks you envision? My last inquiry is where are the funds coming from or is it going to be "WE THE TAXPAYERS" supporting this ludicrous idea?

The final plan should allow for future increases in motels, hotels, cabins, and RV parks based on the economics and the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). An ad-hoc team would be invaluable as a screening source before BOR takes on the Counties of Napa and Solano on increased uses at the lake. The plan should also have periodic reviews every 2-3 years to fine-tune the plan as the years go by so the plan addresses the changes in economics and the uses and needs of the public, residents, and regulatory agencies.

RETAIL OUTLETS

Questions:

What types of retail outlets or merchandise do you feel are necessary at Lake Berryessa: Marina and boating supplies? Groceries? Camping or RV supplies? Souvenirs and gifts? Hiking or fishing supplies? General sundries (books, health, postcards, etc.)? Other?

Primary retail outlets should be convenience stores; i.e., 7-11. Visitors tend to bring everything they need with them.

Retail outlets should be left to the cities and small towns. This is not an area for retail outlets.

I don't believe the lake can support any more retail outlets, but if any are built, they should not be near the shore.

Add a full-service grocery store, gas station, and a post office (for long-term trailer owners).

Bait & Tackle shop.

Other comments on future retail needs?

Gasoline sales.

There are sufficient retail outlets at the marinas.

I feel current retail outlets should be left 'as is.'

I think each concessionaire has done a good job meeting the needs.

Retail outlets are appropriate and should be increased as necessary.

I believe the sale of MTBE gasoline should be banned at the lake. (My in-laws drink water from Lake Berryessa as residents of Fairfield).

MARINAS

Questions:

What types of marina facilities would you like to see in the future: Long-/short-term slip rentals? Dockside utilities?

Land-based boat/trailer storage?

Public Marina with time-limited parking.

More long and short-term rental slips are needed. All marinas should have a gas dock. There needs to be more law enforcement around these areas.

Some of the resorts are not keeping their rental slips up in a safe manner.

There is a demonstrated need for additional public boat ramps and parking facilities for the increased boat access.

All marinas should have 10-20 courtesy docks for the general public.

Are current marina facilities adequate?

Current marina facilities seem to be adequate.

Marina facilities are adequate. More courtesy docks would be helpful and of course cheaper gas.

Gas sales should include both premium and regular grades.

Other comments on future marina needs?

Marinas and boat storage should include all of these services mentioned except private houseboat slips and the current level is slightly less than adequate.

Parking at the free launch ramp should be expanded somehow or another free launch ramp in another location.

Currently there is only one free launch. There is a need to have additional free or fee launch areas. Parking and launching on busy weekends at the free launch is impossible and dangerous.

Need to improve the coverage/visibility of the boat patrol (sheriff).

I would like to see the number of marina facilities reduced, and the marinas that remain be upgraded.

While the current marinas may be adequate, they are designed to look like private resorts that do not offer public access to the water. The marinas should have other public access opportunities for the water, including restaurants and shoreline access.

GENERAL - Lake Berryessa is not presently fulfilling its potential as a public recreation area. The VSP should provide a

bearing for recreation and environmental management at lake for the next 15 to 20 years.

*** How have you let the public at the lake and the general population know anything about what is going on?*

BOR Response #10 - BOR has taken every reasonable action possible to publicize the VSP activity at Lake Berryessa.

Following is a list of those actions over the past 15 months:

1. Formal News Releases to all media.
2. Development of "Lake Berryessa VSP Webpage."
3. Direct informational mailings to long-term permittees and resort owners.
4. Newsletters mailed out directly to over 1,000 people on the VSP mailing list.
5. Numerous meetings with trailer owners and their representatives (Vallejo and at lake).
6. Several special tours for media and Congressional staffers.
7. The formal scoping process of which these responses are an example.
8. Posting of bulletins and posters at all resorts.

***BOR staff has stated on no less than two occasions that the plan has already been made and our letters may only help in the final process. If a plan has been developed may I see it? Bulletin 1 states there will be written Draft Alternatives by now - where are they? I understand the audit by the IG claimed BOR failed to enforce contracts with the Concessionaires leading to the worst managed of all the 300 BOR recreation areas. A major change is needed and time is of the essence. This does not give DOI the right to sidestep Federal planning processes such as the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)...and clearly NEPA is not being followed.*

BOR Response #11 - If any BOR employees said the plan has already been made, they are mistaken. The process that is now going forward is the action that will eventually result in a plan. The first bulletin's timeframe was corrected by the second bulletin, and there are not yet draft alternatives. To stay as current as possible, it would be better to look at the schedule on the webpage at www.mp.usbr.gov/berryessa as we try to keep it updated. It is likely that projected dates will continue to be altered. We don't agree the process is failing to follow NEPA guidelines.

Leave the existing concessionaires where they are.

***I am extremely saddened by the way owners have maintained their resorts. Since we purchased in Putah Creek, the condition of facilities has gone downhill. My suggestion is instead of ending the contracts, it would be better to issue longer contracts to allow owners a chance to make capital improvements and recover their investments over time.*

BOR Response #12 - It should be noted that Putah Creek and all of the resorts are nearing the end of extremely long 50-year contracts. The length of a contract is no assurance that facilities will be properly maintained or that concessionaires will display effective business practices.

As with many elements of the VSP, you make assumptions without providing backup data. How do you define "not fulfilling its potential as a public recreation area"? May I see the data? I have gone scuba diving at Pt. Lobos where they only allow 30 pairs of divers at a time. If I were a developer, I'd want to build a resort on Big Island and bus people in from San Francisco for package vacations. Are these examples of "fulfilling potential?" ... Even if I didn't own one, I believe long-term trailer use, specifically at Lake Berryessa and especially since it has existed there for decades, is not incompatible with the goals of the VSP nor fundamentally contrary to BOR policy. The evaluation of the cost/benefit of arbitrarily removing all long-term sites compared with maintaining most of them to acceptable environmental standards has not been made. There is no compelling public policy benefit to the removal of long-term trailers. ... I also have strong reservations about the VSP process as it has been presented to us since it seems to exist primarily as a justification to force increased use of the lake which is then used to justify removal of the trailers - with all other elements of the plan skewed to support those policies.

Roads to and from the lake and around the lake are in poor shape to handle additional traffic.

More law enforcement is needed. How will Napa County address this?

Need more security.

From Capell Cove nearly to Monticello Dam, people cannot launch a boat or even stroll along the shore without paying an entry fee to resort owners. Along the eastern shore, public access is similarly restricted. Ranches extend along the shoreline in that area, served by a publically maintained road. The road is posted for no trespassing. ... As resort contracts are renegotiated, we believe that priority should be given to ensuring open public access for hiking and similar low-impact activities. These uses do not interfere with resort operations such as cabin rentals and marinas. ... We believe the eastern road should be opened for public access into the areas that are public property. Currently visitor amenities at the lake favor fishing, jet ski, and powerboat enthusiasts. Entirely lacking are trails along the shore, whether for hiking, biking, or horseback riding. The campgrounds on the lake are all privately owned and due to the crowded layouts they are deficient in any sense of blending into the natural environment. ... A portion of BOR budgeting for the lake should be devoted to the development and maintenance of trails, environmental education, and other amenities to encourage low-impact usages such as non-motorized boating and wildlife viewing. One project worth exploring would be the creation of a network of trails encircling the lake, perhaps with some hike-in campsites. ... It is apparent that current resort contracts and BOR management policies do not establish clear responsibility for maintenance of environmental standards. ... future contracts must dictate better control of potential pollution sources. ... Careful thought must be given to the quantity of visitors which the lake and surroundings can absorb without undue adverse impact. For example, roads to the lake are in many places quite narrow and winding, some with one-lane bridges. ... BOR should commit itself to a VSP which enables local residents and tourists to explore and appreciate this impressive wild area in ways which maintain its natural values.

Every year people are killed/seriously injured jumping from the big rocks into Pope Creek: this needs to be addressed.

BOR has already made up its mind on what it will and will not do to the lake area and before they go any further, they should be sitting down with a citizens advisory committee.

My main concern as a Steele Park mobile home owner is that there not be any effort to reduce the number of long-term uses such as Steele Park provides. I generally agree with the goals of eliminating dry sites over some time or at least ensuring compliance with health and safety codes. I also understand the need to mitigate situations where the sites are below flood level although I don't see a need to require removal after 2009 if mitigation can be properly addressed.

Preferred Action #10 of the RAMP is the development of a low-density, high-quality campground and day use area on the West shore, North of Putah Creek Resort. This area should include the existing Boy Scout Camp. ... This entire area is the most logical for significantly expanding camping and day use facilities. Development should include water, showers, restrooms with flush toilets, BBQ pits, picnic tables, RV sites, and a launch ramp. ... This campground should accommodate groups or individual campers. Campsites would be available by reservation only during peak periods.

My father purchased a mobile home at Steele Park in 1967 and held it until 1980 when there was talk of the feds eliminating resorts and long-term sites. He sold out of concern that he would lose what he had invested. ... As it turned out, he sold for no reason because the contracts were extended. Wanting the same opportunity for my two boys, I purchased a mobile home there 4 years ago and have enjoyed tremendously the chance to see them have the same joys and opportunities that my brother and I did. I am concerned about the uncertainty this cycle of planning seems to have brought about. I fully understand and agree with the recent actions to address pollution/safety issues by BOR. From what I've read on your website ... there is no intent to require existing long-term sites to be removed, save the exceptions mentioned above. I'd appreciate a more explicit answer to this issue. Indeed, these long-term sites provide year-round revenue to the resort concessionaires that make it reasonably profitable for them. Otherwise, I think they would have a tough time maintaining solvency. I would support some limits on the amount of increases in fees they may require, having seen my monthly fees raised more than 25 percent in the past 4 years. ... It would be wonderful if mobile home owners could secure long-term leases ... and have the opportunity to sublet or rent them out under certain conditions. Best of all would be to see these areas within the resorts privatized so we could own the land as well. ... I want to express appreciation to BOR for providing this opportunity to comment and have input. I think you are doing a good job of communicating with folks, especially the information you provide on your website.

Questions:

Do you have any other questions or comments regarding concerns or perceived needs for the lake regarding public recreation facilities and services?

More activities at the lake such as horseback riding, learning how to fish, boat safety classes, and learning how to swim safely, maybe even CPR, etc.

A medical facility at the lake.

See that standards are followed for sewage, clean water, etc.

If you give LB to the public, you will have what you had Memorial Weekend, trash up to the lake, all over the campgrounds, urinating all over, and probably more deaths. We are the people too. We would like to keep it the way it is.

More shopping, lodging, and dining services should be encouraged; however, I don't believe now or in the next 20 years the area will enjoy enough year-round use to support such a venture.

Dry sites should be removed. Options should be offered to those tenants for other sites.

I am getting quite frustrated with the way the resorts disregard the rules and the way BOR seems to allow it to happen ... I feel ALL parties should be forced into compliance immediately; to allow this behavior to continue until the end of the contracts will allow the resorts to use the 'past practice' claim and ... this mess will end up in litigation for years.

All new residential development shall conform to either the Napa County building regulations or the Minimum Property Standards under HUD. Existing non-compliance for residential housing shall conform to the standards within a 10-year period from adoption of the VSP.

BOR will need to conduct an EIS for the implementation of the plan that will allow for public comment. The impact on future traffic for residents and public use of BOR facilities, environmental pollution, noise pollution, water impacts, increased fire damage, and improved infrastructure required to mitigate the EIS impacts will need to be addressed.

All laws and regulations should be complied with, in a uniform fashion, throughout the seven parks. Uniform signage should be accomplished.

Low fees can be considered by BOR for its managed sites as long as they take into account the needs of those with limited sources of income.

Create a means to inspect and assess compliance and conformance to the contracts by the concessionaires. That would require that a team of inspectors be assembled, not just BOR staff, but Napa County and local regulators will need to make up this team. This would fairly represent and protect the public, residents, and contractors.

When the new concessionaires' leases have been prepared (assuming that over the years lease conditions have changes that require a new lease document), it would make sense to have the lease language available for public comments which would hopefully preclude future questions. You know that everyone is going to wonder what benefits and requirements are in the lease and what is required of the concessionaires as they go about their business.

BOR should continue the management of these Federal areas with a review in 10 years of their performance with the possibility of conversion to a concession operation in the event of poor performance. The plan would need to address the need to have a panel of interested persons develop the performance standards that BOR would need to meet in order to continue its management role.

The plan will need to have the ability for change during its life. This is very important and the changes would be reviewed by an ad-hoc team ... and after approval by BOR would be immediately implemented.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) will need to be included in your plan and how it addresses (with sensibility) access to public and concessionaire facilities. Existing facilities will need to be brought up to the requirements within the plan and they should be generous in compliance. Say 2 years after enactment of the plan for public access and restrooms and the balance to be fully compliant within 6 years after enactment of the plan.

I think there is a need for long-term and short-term in the concessions with control on what they can and cannot do.

People (permittees) have spent many thousands of dollars with BOR 'OK' to build retaining walls. Will these stabilization attempts be removed? If this will not now be allowed, why OK them just last year?

Maybe fussing over this little lake will bring improvements, but the lake can accommodate only so many people then it will be like Yosemite, almost destroyed.

I have been enjoying Lake Berryessa for the last 15 years. I have a trailer at Rancho Monticello ... it's good to see the new interest in the lake, but I'm not sure the new plans are in the best interest of the lake and surrounding land. I appreciate BOR & BLM cleaning up the sites that are in dispute. I work on the Beautification Committee at Rancho. I believe the reservoir has gained from all the interest. It's good to see my neighbors cleaning and repairing their sites.

I would like to see free public access to the lake for hiking, sightseeing, and boat launching (especially non-motorized) at the south end of the lake. Currently, the concessionaires control public access to most of the south end of the lake. Steele Park and Pleasure Cove are prime examples.

Need buoys to protect the swimmers near blind corner areas (what happened to the buoys we helped purchase?).

I believe that a long-term phase-out of 2-cycle engines should begin as soon as possible.

I believe there should be enforcement of laws against boating while intoxicated.

I believe there should be a noise ordinance for boats at the lake.

There needs to be more public land around the lake. The current land ownership pattern created a bathtub ring of public land, thus relegating the lake area to water-based recreation only.