
Appendix C

Problem Statement for the RMP

FINAL PROBLEM STATEMENT

Henry Hagg Lake

Resource Management Plan (RMP)

Introduction

This Problem Statement is intended to portray all points of view regarding the issues, opportunities, and options identified by the public and involved agencies as relevant to the Henry Hagg Lake Resource Management Plan (RMP) process.

The issues, opportunities, and options discussed are presented in the same order and use the same titles and numbers shown on the Summary of Issues, Opportunities, and Options, which was provided to and discussed with the Ad Hoc Work Group (AHWG) at its first meeting on February 12, 2002. The sources for that Summary were the public input received: (1) at, or as a result of, the first RMP public meeting; and (2) in response to the first RMP Newsbrief.

For each issue/opportunity/option discussed, the information provided reflects the AHWG/Planning Team discussions that occurred during the February 12 and May 23, 2002 meetings. In a limited number of cases, "Planning Team Notes" are also included to: (1) provide additional perspectives on issues based on Planning Team experience, (2) clarify discussions, or (3) indicate where Reclamation or other agency regulations or limitations will affect the range of possible responses. It should also be noted that, although it is Reclamation's practice to report all input received on issues and opportunities pertinent to its Resource Management Plan efforts, this reporting does not necessarily infer endorsement of all comments received and outlined in this document.

Issue/opportunity/option discussions are organized according to the following major and subtopics:

Overall Concerns (numbered O-1 through O-7)

- Balanced Use
- Conflicting Uses
- Crowding
- Season of Use

Natural and Cultural Resources (numbered N-1 through N-27)

- Wildlife/Habitat (including wetland and riparian habitat)
- Fishery
- Non-Native Species and Pest Control
- Water Quality
- Erosion and Sedimentation
- Aesthetic Resources
- Interpretive Programs and Signage

Recreation and Other Uses (numbered R-1 through R-39)

- General Character, Use, and Facilities
- Day Use Facilities (general)
- Area A-East
- Overnight Use
- Trails and Trail Use
- Concessions
- Boating
- Fishing
- Other Uses

Access, Parking, and Surrounding Uses (numbered A-1 through A-13)

- Roads
- Parking
- Shoreline/Bank Access
- Accessibility
- Surrounding Uses

Management and Implementation (numbered M-1 through M-28)

- Reservoir Operations
- Study Area Data
- Health, Safety, and Security
- Public Information
- Fees/fee Structure
- Funding and Implementation

Overall Concerns

Balanced Use

- **O-1 Recreation & natural resources; O-2 Balance has swung too far toward recreation; and O-3 Sustainability of uses & resources:** There is a general sense that establishing a proper and sustainable balance between recreation access/use and protection of natural resource values at Hagg Lake is a central challenge of this RMP effort. Aspects of and perspectives regarding this challenge are found throughout this Problem Statement.

For example, much of the public input received in the planning process to date, reinforced by AHWG discussion, stresses that Hagg Lake/Scoggins Valley Park should retain a rural, open, natural character, rather than evolve into a more active, urban-type park. This sentiment argues against developed features such as ball parks and suggests that further conversion of park lands from open space/habitat to recreation sites should be minimized. On the other hand, demand for recreational access to and use of the park is high and is increasing. This is true in terms of both: [1] the number of users, especially during peak times; and [2] the trend toward a longer season of use.

As the RMP process begins, it is debatable whether comment O-2 is true. AHWG members who discussed this issue do not necessarily agree with the perspective expressed, saying in essence that “balance is in the eye of the beholder.” Some perceive that more recreation accommodation is needed, rather than less. The RMP will need to take a look at the carrying capacity and sustainability of resources at the lake before conclusions can be drawn about how much recreation is enough or too much.

In any case, the RMP will need to study the relationship between use levels and locations on one hand, and the sustainability of resource values such as water quality and wildlife habitat on the other. Exploration of alternatives for the future of the lake/park will need to array the types of resource tradeoffs that may be necessary if additional recreation capacity is to be accommodated. Conversely, the alternatives should help frame the types of limitations that may need to be placed on recreation if wildlife habitat, water quality, visual quality, etc. are to be protected.

(Planning Team Note: The RMP process and its associated Environmental Assessment (EA) will rely on existing information and the input of knowledgeable County and other agency personnel to assess the recreation carrying capacity of the lake. One existing source of information that will be used is the 1999 Study of Recreation Users at Henry Hagg Lake.)

Conflicting Uses

- **O-4 Need better management of uses, better conflict management:** Aside from the broad issue of crowding and shortage of facility capacity (See O-6, below), the park seems to be well managed, with user conflicts kept to a minimum. This is particularly evident given the high level of use that occurs at peak times. The only areas of user conflict (existing or potential) that have been highlighted to date are related to: [1] special events—see R-3; [2] management of pets—see R-9; [3] multiple uses of the County road—see R-20; and [4] potential for conflict among trail users if equestrian uses are added—see R-21. The potential for overnight use at Area A-East also represents a potential for conflict between park uses and surrounding residents/landowners—see R-11 through R-17.

This issue may require further discussion and specification. If significant conflicts do exist at land-based sites, the RMP should look at the potential for distributing uses in other areas of the park and taking pressure off such high-use areas as A and C Ramps; or, if such re-distribution of use is not feasible, use conflicts may be a signal that the carrying capacity of these areas has been reached, pointing to a potential need to limit use.

Related to water-based uses, activity levels are rising, with personal watercraft (PWC) leading the way. For both boats and personal watercraft, enforcement of no-wake zones and setbacks and other speed limits is a priority both to minimize conflicts and promote public safety.

- **O-5** Reduce conflicts between special events & other uses: See R-3.

Crowding

- **O-6** Address land and water crowding: There is no current definition or specification of park capacity. Crowding does occur at peak times, especially at the main land-based recreation sites. July is the peak month at the park, with opening day of the fishing season in April and Father's Day in June as examples of peak days.

Concerns over park capacity and crowding apply to facilities/destinations within the park, the water surface, and traffic and parking throughout the park. Perspectives on recreation capacity, crowding, and expansion needs/opportunities are discussed under the Recreation heading herein; for discussion of traffic and parking concerns, see A-1 through A-6. Overall, when considering capacity and crowding questions, it should also be kept in mind that limits on use will also place limits on County revenue to operate and maintain the park.

Season of Use

- **O-7** General desire to increase season of use: The primary impetus for increasing the season of use at the Park has been to permit a longer fishing season. However, any extension of the season to accommodate fishing would also mean the park is open to other users. This issue, including its implications on resources, is discussed under R-33 and M-23 through 25, below.

Natural and Cultural Resources

Wildlife/Habitat

- **N-1** Maintain, manage, protect: Maintaining, properly managing, and protecting the natural resources of the lake/park environment, including the vegetation and wildlife habitat, is a strong direction and motivation for the RMP effort. More detailed perspectives in this regard are provided in the discussions below.
- **N-2** Wildlife/human interaction and **N-3** Increase conservation & preservation; maintain feel of natural area; overuse/abuse of pristine area (related topics, discussed together herein): Striking the right balance between: [1] the desire to maintain, protect, and perhaps restore (see N-4 through N-7) wildlife habitat; and [2] providing recreational access is one of the challenges of the RMP effort. AHWG discussion of this challenge raised the following points:

- The focus of concern is the area between the road and the lake shore.
 - The RMP should investigate opportunities for setting aside areas exclusively for wildlife (e.g., no recreation sites, trails, or boating, with potential opportunities being in the arms, such as Scoggins and Tanner creeks). It is uncertain whether such action is feasible or practical; nevertheless, the idea of emphasizing “refuge for wildlife” in some areas is worth pursuing.
 - Even if completely “human free” areas are not practical, retaining areas with minimal/controlled access will still be important.
 - From a resource protection and conservation standpoint, new recreation development should be restricted to expansion of existing sites, rather than opening new areas for development. For example, if the suggestion to provide a boat ramp for use by non-motorized boats is pursued, such a feature should not be sited in a currently undeveloped area, further fragmenting the habitat and open space resources of the park.
 - Heavy use, such as special events, should be managed to avoid periods of high resource sensitivity or potential for resource damage. For example, race events during wet periods of time can result in considerable damage to trail corridors in the park.
 - Recreation in general should be oriented more to enjoyment of natural resources and environmental values, rather than toward more urban park features such as ball fields.
 - The widespread presence of pets can be detrimental to natural habitat values. County regulations allow pets within the park; but require that they be on-leash. These regulations should be strictly enforced. People should also be encouraged/required to clean up after their pets.
 - The public should be discouraged from feeding park wildlife and from bringing in and “dropping off” non-native wildlife such as ducks.
 - For any actions aimed at restricting/limiting recreational access as a means of protecting wildlife habitat, adequate enforcement will be needed.
- **N-4 Restore, enhance natural habitat (e.g., waterfowl habitat):** Opportunities to restore or enhance habitat can be organized into three focal areas, each of which should be explored in the RMP process: [1] upland habitat, [2] wetland and riparian habitat/shoreline vegetation, and [3] fish habitat. These are discussed separately below.
 - **Upland Habitat:** The two primary opportunities for restoring or enhancing upland habitat are the existing elk meadows and Area A-East.

The elk meadows are artificially maintained in grassland. Restoration of these areas to a more native habitat matrix presents a potential opportunity. However, as discussed under N-8 through N-10, below, it is uncertain whether such an action is either desirable (given local elk management concerns) or feasible (given that these meadows are part of the original impact mitigation program associated with development of the dam and reservoir).

Restoration of habitat should at least be considered as one alternative future for Area A-East. Beyond the elk meadows, this is the only other large area where significant flexibility exists for upland habitat restoration and enhancement.

- **Wetland and Riparian Habitat/Shoreline Vegetation:** Efforts to restore or enhance wetland and riparian habitat or shoreline vegetation in general can focus on: [1] the existing lake shore and tributary stream corridors, with the limitations imposed by the fluctuating water level of the lake; and/or [2] development of sub-impoundments or cofferdams at

appropriate locations to provide more stable aquatic conditions conducive to habitat restoration.

Any feasible opportunity to restore wetlands, riparian, or other vegetation to the shoreline should be pursued (the shore is essentially devoid of vegetation). However, the wide fluctuations in water level due to reservoir operations severely restricts the potential for such restoration. Such efforts would have the best potential for success in the tributary stream corridors entering the lake, where water conditions are more natural and stable. Along the main lake shore, a concept which should at least be explored is the use of downed trees, branches, and other organic debris to provide habitat and support re-vegetation. Many truckloads of these materials are removed from the dam area each year; much of it could be beneficially “re-used” by anchoring it to the shore at various elevations both to promote restoration of shoreline vegetation and to provide additional fish habitat during periods of the year. This could be accomplished through volunteer efforts, and the cost of hauling away this biomass could be reduced or eliminated. One concern related to this concept is the potential for impact on boater safety in the form of floating and/or subsurface hazards; this concern would need to be adequately addressed if the concept is pursued.

Sub-impoundments or cofferdams have been suggested in the tributary arms of the lake, such as Tanner and Sain creeks. Such features would mitigate the water fluctuations and increase the potential for wetland and riparian habitat creation/restoration; they would also provide additional habitat for waterfowl and other wildlife species and would help protect water quality in the lake. However, members of the AHWG suggest caution in considering such structural approaches, citing concerns regarding both the real potential for long-term success (at least, without significant maintenance efforts/costs) and the adverse impacts such developments can have on fish migration and other resource parameters.

Another concept is the creation of a sub-impoundment in the inlet/bay east of the proposed Education/Research Center site. Creating a sub-impoundment in this location, with relocation of the trail across the cofferdam and away from the existing shore, would support both: [1] reservation/creation of habitat area, and [2] research into various aspects of habitat restoration and development.

(Planning Team Note: Any proposals for sub-impoundments will require further study to determine the impacts to water operations, water quality, and fish migration as a result of these changes to the lake. Also, in order for Reclamation to cost share for this type of improvement there would need to be a non-Federal public entity as a managing partner.)

- **Fish Habitat:** Regardless of perspectives on fish stocking, warm vs. cold water fishery, fishing season, etc. (see N-14 through N-17), it would be beneficial to increase fish habitat in general. This means increasing shore-zone and sub-surface structure at all levels. The above discussion of wetland, riparian, and shoreline vegetation, including the potential for re-use of downed logs, branches, and other organic debris, is relevant in this regard. Even if restoration of shoreline vegetation is not generally feasible, anchoring logs and branches, even Christmas trees and other organic debris, at various levels along the fluctuating shore zone can provide fish habitat. Using old tires and other types of debris can also help but is less desirable. As noted above, the potential for these actions to create boating hazards, especially as the reservoir is drawn down, would need to be addressed.
- **N-5 Develop/protect wetlands & riparian areas:** Protection of existing wetland and riparian areas will be emphasized in the RMP, as required by Federal regulations and Executive Orders.

Perspectives on the potential to enhance or restore these resources are discussed under N-4, above.

- **N-6 Provide wildlife refuge areas; consider the study of Wapato Lake refuge:** The desirability of providing areas around the lake where wildlife and native vegetation are emphasized (and recreation de-emphasized) is discussed above. However, the Wapato Lake refuge example is not applicable to Hagg Lake.
- **N-7 Threatened and endangered species:** The RMP will respond to identified needs for protecting habitat for protected species and species of concern at both the Federal and State levels. These include bald eagles, State-listed frogs, turtles, plant species, and others. Important directions will most likely include:
 - Protecting and restoring riparian and wetland habitat where feasible; the main focus for sensitive species is in the upper arms/tributaries of the lake.
 - Restricting or discouraging recreational or other access to sensitive species habitat.
 - Protecting bald eagle perch trees and snags around the lake and an eagle nest buffer zone in the Southeast (eagles do not nest in the study area, but the upper reach of the Sain Creek arm is within a recommended secondary buffer zone around a nest outside the study area; also, eagles do feed at the lake, and 5 or 6 perch trees were identified in the Education/Research Center study).
 - Avoiding cofferdams or sub-impoundments that would obstruct fish migration.
- **N-8 Elk (and eagles) importance (discussion of eagles moved to N-7); N-9 Elk management--leave them alone, avoid adverse impact to them; and, N-10 Elk management--prepare an Elk Management Plan...provide habitat, reduce conflicts with roads/other uses, control illegal hunting** (discussed as a group): As part of the wildlife impact mitigation program associated with construction of the dam and reservoir, areas around the lake and a large area immediately downstream of the dam were set aside as elk habitat. These “elk meadows” are mowed annually and maintained in grassland for use by elk. Elk herds resident to the upper Tualatin watershed migrate to these open grass areas to feed, especially the area below the dam.

Public concern about the local elk population has several facets. On one hand, the visiting public values the presence of the elk and wants to see them protected. On the other hand, the elk pose a problem for farmers and other landowners surrounding the lake by causing damage to land and crops when they travel back and forth between the grasslands around the lake and the forested uplands. The migrating elk can also cause traffic safety problems as they cross the highway getting to and from the lake.

The RMP needs to explore appropriate and feasible responses to these varying concerns, including options for the maintained elk meadows around the lake. Additional study of the local elk herd (their needs and habits) may be necessary to enable a more comprehensive elk management strategy. For example:

- It is unclear whether: [1] maintaining the elk meadows around the lake causes migration across private land that would not otherwise occur; or [2] maintaining these meadows serves to limit elk damage to surrounding lands (i.e., by providing forage that the elk would otherwise seek more directly on surrounding lands instead of just migrating through them).
- It is unclear how much the elk meadows are currently used and or which areas are being used by the elk since monitoring is not occurring.

- More fundamentally, it is unclear whether Reclamation has any flexibility in modifying or eliminating the elk meadows. Further research and discussion with ODFW is needed to determine Reclamation's responsibilities.
- Poaching of elk is a problem that must be addressed through better enforcement.

(Planning Team Note: Questions surrounding elk use of the study area and Reclamation's responsibilities related to the elk meadows need to be resolved before these meadows can be considered for other uses, such as recreation or the Education/Research Center).

- **N-11** Consider cofferdam/sub-impoundment in Tanner Creek arm for habitat development: Discussed above under N-4 and N-7.
- **N-12** Provide raptor nesting platforms: Protection of existing perch/nest trees, snags around the reservoir, and other natural raptor habitat features is desirable. However, little, if any, emphasis should be placed on providing artificial nesting platforms or other such features. These can cause conflicts with other uses that would not otherwise occur. Perhaps such features may be appropriate in areas set aside for wildlife habitat (i.e., at the exclusion of recreation uses) or as part of the proposed Education/Research Center.
- **N-13** Noxious weed control: See N-18 and N-19.

Fishery

(Planning Team Note: Discussion of fish habitat in general is included under N-4, above; discussions below address more specific questions such as type of fishery, stocking programs, and fishing season.)

- **N-14** Restrict recreation access/use if necessary, especially if we have year-round fishing: Increases in recreational use at the Lake, including fishing, correspondingly increase stress on the fishery. However, the fishery at Hagg Lake is a "put and take" fishery, wherein ODFW provides fish stocking at levels aimed at meeting demand. At this point in time, no problem with imbalance between "supply" and "demand" is anticipated. It will be ODFW's continuing management responsibility to monitor fishery conditions and make adjustments to either stocking or fishing season/pressure is an imbalance occurs.

(Planning Team Note: A year-round fishing season is no longer being discussed by the managing agencies at Hagg Lake. The fishing season has been extended from 6 to 9 months starting in 2002—see R-33.)

- **N-15** Address implications from eliminating fish stocking (i.e no more BOR funding for this program): The fish stocking program (i.e. trout) at Hagg Lake is not being eliminated; it is continuing under ODFW management and funding. In fact, ODFW will be increasing its stocking program to accommodate the newly extended fishing season noted above.

The change which has occurred is that Reclamation is no longer providing supplemental funding for the stocking program. Reclamation's funding for stocking was part of the original fish mitigation tied to authorization of the Project and was on an interim basis. That mitigation program has now been completed. Future Reclamation funding for the fishery at Hagg Lake is being dedicated to habitat enhancement, through the Watershed Council, rather than to ODFW stocking. The RMP effort cannot control this change.

- **N-16** Put excess ODFW steelhead in lake, if feasible & if no detrimental effects: While this may be a “nice idea,” it is not feasible and need not be pursued as part of the RMP (see N-15, above).
- **N-17** Impact of non-native fish species/stocking programs--decline of resident fish such as trout: With the stocking program, Hagg Lake has both a cold water (predominantly trout) and warm water fishery, with small populations of native trout in the tributaries to the lake (e.g. Scoggins Creek). This is technically a “non-native” condition, but is common in reservoir situations. Given these conditions, it is true that undesirable non-native fish species have been introduced over time. These introductions have been done illegally by the public (most likely unwittingly—not aware of the damage they can cause to populations of desirable species). These illegal introductions may continue without adequate public education and enforcement.

Non-Native Species & Pest Control

- **N-18** Control noxious weeds, and **N-19** Non-native species control (plants & animals--e.g. domestic ducks, milfoil, zebra mussels, hydrilya): Control of noxious weeds and other non-native plant species, both terrestrial and aquatic, is an important concern, as are introductions of non-native terrestrial or aquatic animal species. WACO is responsible for weed control in the park and TVID is responsible for weed control in the Reclamation zone around the dam.

An inventory should be done to identify and confirm noxious weed problem locations and species. A program for defining the spread of other non-native plant and animal species should also be pursued. Control programs should be integrated with overall habitat protection and restoration efforts. In all cases, control methods should emphasize biological and physical techniques and minimize use of chemicals.

An important aspect of dealing with both noxious weeds and other introduced species is public education/information, particularly signage. For example, problems with introduced species can be caused by out-of-region or out-of-state visitors unwittingly bringing undesirable species (such as zebra mussels—not sighted yet, but a threat) on their boats. Adequate cleaning of boats prior to launching can help avoid these problems.

Another aspect of pest management, not directly referenced in comments N-18 or N-19, is control of yellow jackets and bees, and to a lesser extent, mosquitos. Each year, the fire department received numerous calls due to yellow jacket or bee stings. AHWG discussion suggests that control of these insects may be warranted in developed recreation sites; however, attempts to control populations throughout the park is most likely not feasible or desirable. WACO currently conducts pest control around developed recreation sites, as necessary.

(Planning Team Note: Reclamation will be preparing an Integrated Pest Management Plan as a parallel effort in conjunction with the RMP. This Plan will be coordinated closely with WACO’s ongoing efforts and will address the issues described above).

Water Quality

- **N-20** Protect water quality; **N-21** Address pollution concerns--land garbage, water pollution (e.g., boat oil & gas), toilet facilities; **N-22** Recreation impacts/capacity vs. water quality (e.g., silt/turbidity from boat waves); and **N-23** Water-related issues (discussed as a group): Perspectives on water quality include:

- **Erosion and sedimentation**, and resultant **turbidity** in the lake water, is a concern from both the watershed surrounding and from within the RMP study area. The Watershed Council and others take the lead in plans and programs to limit these factors in the surrounding watershed. The RMP should address erosion control locally, including proper design, maintenance, and repair of trails and roads, revegetation of denuded areas, protection and restoration of wetlands, and treatment of major and minor tributaries as “bioswales.”
- **Fuel and oil** from boats is often a concern at lakes and reservoirs; however, currently this does not appear to be a problem at Hagg Lake. Further, the transition from 2-stroke to 4-stroke marine engines which will result from EPA regulations should ease future concern for this source of pollution. Nevertheless, the RMP should promote proper management of marine fuels and lubricants at the lake and vigilance in monitoring for potential pollution problems from these sources.
- Pollution from **litter** along the shoreline is cited as a problem by many. Provision of adequate trash receptacles, public education/signage, and enforcement are necessary to address this problem.
- The potential for pollution from **restroom facilities** was noted. However, this does not seem to be a problem at present. The RMP should nevertheless incorporate an objective to make sure that this source of wastewater is properly and effectively managed into the future.

Erosion & Sedimentation

- N-24 Control/reduce/minimize: See N-20 through N-23.

Aesthetic Resources

- N-25 Consider visual impacts of actions, including timber harvest and N-26 Consider sound & light impacts of actions (e.g., night views): These issue statements are relatively self-explanatory. Overall, the design of facilities and RMP actions/programs in general should not be intrusive; they should blend with the natural environment as much as possible and minimize visual impact both within the RMP study area and as related to surrounding properties.

(Planning Team Note: Visual impacts of timber harvest in the area are caused predominantly by activities outside the RMP study area. The RMP could include an objective to work with/encourage the County and surrounding landowners to minimize/mitigate adverse visual quality impacts on the park environment caused by surrounding land use activities.)

Interpretive Programs & Signage

- N-27 Increase emphasis on natural resource interpretation: The RMP should provide increased opportunities for nature interpretation and education (e.g., nature trails, interpretive signage, etc.). The same is true for the culture and history of the area. These are the positive aspects of public information, education, and enjoyment; and they go hand-in-hand with cautionary and regulatory programs aimed at protecting resources (e.g., education/regulations regarding introduced species, control of pets, access limitations, etc.).

Recreation and Other Land Uses

General Character, Use, and Facilities

- **R-1 Maintain rural feel vs. urban park character; no commercial development:** AHWG members generally agree that a rural feel/atmosphere should be maintained in the RMP study area; actions or plans that would promote a more developed, urban character should be avoided. This overall sense is supported by other comments that stress better/more attention to protecting and restoring wildlife habitat, avoidance of “urban park” features such as ball fields, etc.

Specific to the issue of commercial development (meaning primarily concessions), the following points were made:

- Currently, small boat rental and food concessions operate at the park. These are not in permanent facilities and are able to move to different locations in the park. A desire has been expressed to provide more permanent facilities for these services.
 - Many members of the public feel that some minimum level of commercial service is desirable (a viewpoint supported by public input received by the County during its last planning effort). Perhaps the viewpoint for consideration now is better phrased: “no additional commercial development,” rather than no commercial services at all.
 - Recognizing that the status quo (i.e., no additional commercial development) is an option, the RMP should nevertheless explore alternatives for providing desirable commercial services, at a minimal level, in more permanent, aesthetically appropriate facilities. It may be possible to provide services such as boat and mountain bike rentals, prepared foods, and basic picnic supplies while still maintaining the rural atmosphere. The question then becomes: how far do we carry this? (e.g., do we add personal watercraft rentals? What kinds of boats? What level of retail service for foods, picnic, fishing supplies?)
 - Another consideration related to commercial/concession activity is that it provides a revenue stream to the County. Since the County must provide all funds for operating and maintaining the park, this existing and potential source of revenue is critical.
- **R-2 Better facility planning:** Without specifics, the reason for this comment is not clear. It is generally agreed that effective planning is important; in fact, that is why the RMP is being prepared. However, it is also generally felt that the County has done a good job in planning for the park. The RMP should build on what the County has done to date.
- **R-3 Continued use for special events:** Special events that currently take place in the park, such as biathlons, fishing derbies, and bike races, serve an important function, are generally well run, and should be a continuing aspect of park operation. The most important considerations in managing these events are to [1] avoid/minimize potential conflicts with general public use of the park and with normal traffic on the roadways, and [2] minimize scheduling these events when resource sensitivities or vulnerabilities are high in order to minimize physical impacts. In the first regard, examples include: [a] special events should generally avoid weekends and other peak use times, especially if the event needs exclusive use of certain areas; [b] events such as races should be scheduled in the morning before peak use period during the day; and [c] special events should be focused at locations away from high use sites such as the A and C Ramps to the extent possible. In the second regard, a primary example is avoiding race events during wet periods, when substantial damage to trail corridors can occur.

The County's current review and approval process for special events is attuned to minimizing conflicts and considers these factors as much as possible. County personnel note, however, that venues which can accommodate these events are scarce and the demand for them is growing. This may thus be another example where carrying capacity of the resource must be considered in the face of increasing demand. The process and criteria used to schedule and approve special events should be incorporated into the RMP, including any appropriate refinements aimed at balancing capacity with demand.

- **R-4 Rename facilities (away from A, B, C designations; enlist school children?):** It is agreed that the current system (i.e., A ramp, C ramp) is confusing. Renaming the facilities is a good idea and offers an opportunity for public involvement, fostering a sense of stewardship.

Day Use Facilities (General)

- **R-5 Increase capacity/availability:** During peak times, such as mid summer, the park is very crowded and it is especially difficult to find a picnic site. This applies to all areas of the park. As use levels increase, this condition will only get worse unless additional capacity is provided. Important considerations in attempting to meet changing and increasing demand include:
 - The land base in the park is limited, and there are few opportunities for new recreation site development. Adding facility capacity, to the extent possible and desirable, should focus mostly on expansion or reconfiguration of existing sites. The Cove area, adjacent to C Ramp, and Area A-East are the primary opportunities for expansion/new development.

(Planning Team Note: During initial field reconnaissance for the RMP, it was noted that, dependent on other values and needs, some of the existing elk pastures might also support recreation facilities; however, resource protection and enhancement concerns may outweigh consideration of such use—see N-4 and N-8 through 10)

- The existing density of facilities (e.g., of picnic tables) at the recreation sites is generally good. Increasing density is not a significant opportunity for adding capacity. Additional land area is needed for this purpose.
- Population dynamics and socioeconomic conditions are changing use characteristics at the park. For example, demand for group facilities is increasing.
- **R-6 Facilities for better beaches--sand needs to be brought in; muddy shoreline and **R-7 Improve access for swimming; provide dedicated areas due to safety concerns; consider floating platforms as an option:** Due to reservoir fluctuations, establishing and maintaining sand beaches artificially is not feasible. Given this, any provision for swimming would need to orient more to platforms or similar solutions. In any case, the County will not formally designate or provide swimming areas due to liability concerns.**
- **R-8 No baseball fields:** There is general agreement on this point. See R-1, above.
- **R-9 Need leash-free zone(s):** This comment could have come from either: [1] people who have dogs and are promoting areas where the dogs can be off-leash; or [2] non-dog owners who want better control of pets in the form of specific leash-free area(s), with leash laws enforced everywhere else. In any case, County ordinance requires dogs to be on-leash in all public areas (i.e. everywhere except on private property). At Hagg Lake, this leash law needs to be more strictly enforced; dogs are found off leash throughout the park.

- **R-10 Develop the Cove area:** See R-5. The Cove area is a primary candidate site for facility expansion. Potential facilities include picnic areas (both individual and group), non-motorized boat launch, parking, trails, and restroom.

Area A-East

- **R-11 Reopen and R-12 Reopen for day use:** Area A-East was an early development at the park. When it was open, it got the least use due to its isolation from the lake shore. It was closed a number of years ago due to enforcement problems associated with illegal activities occurring there; the enforcement problems were due in part to the site's relative isolation from the main activity areas in the park.

For the current RMP effort, the options for re-opening and re-using Area A-East should be reviewed. This is especially true given the increasing visitation to the park and the consequent need for additional facility capacity. The basic options for the area are: [1] overnight camping, [2] some form of day use, and [3] a combination of camping and day use. These are discussed below. In considering potentials for re-opening/re-using Area A-East the RMP process should note that this area is proposed as a borrow site for the alternatives in the Water Supply Feasibility Study which involve raising Scoggins dam.

- **Potential for Overnight Use:** Overnight camping in Area A-East has been discussed a number of times over the past several years. Adjacent residents and landowners have vocally opposed this use due to safety and security concerns; they are apprehensive that the same types of problems that caused the area to be closed in the first place will simply recur. They are also concerned about increased fire danger.

The issues and opportunities surrounding camping use at Area A-East received considerable discussion by participating AHWG members.

Those expressing opposition to or significant concerns about this use reiterated the same issues cited in prior discussions (i.e., safety and security of/for adjacent residents, illegal activities, and fire hazard). The potential for security conflicts between the proposed Education/Research Center and camping activity at Area A-East and the potential for adverse impact to wildlife were also noted.

If camping is again considered for the area, the use must be accompanied by an effective increase in enforcement and public safety presence and/or a significant reduction in response time by law enforcement and public safety personnel to alleviate these concerns. If this increased service cannot be provided, residents and landowners will continue to strongly oppose the use.

Perspectives that favor overnight camping at Area A-East and/or believe that the resident/landowner concerns can be effectively addressed cite the following points:

- Camping would represent a significant revenue stream for the County, both from direct fees paid by visitors and from the County becoming eligible for State RV funds (the latter estimated at \$80,000 per year). As other funding sources become increasingly limited, this revenue could be very important for future development, operation, and maintenance of the park, including subsidizing day use.

- The increased revenue achieved through overnight camping should easily cover an appropriate increase in law enforcement and public safety presence to address resident/landowner concerns.
 - If overnight camping is introduced, it could be designed to inherently address safety and security concerns. For example, a camp host or other staff, and the proximity to park headquarters, could provide constant monitoring of activities and compliance with regulations, such as any fire restrictions. Site design can also address issues of access control and fire management.
 - Having a constant presence at the lake during the recreation season can also help to more effectively spot, report, and respond to fire or other hazards in the surrounding area.
 - Area A-East represents a prime opportunity for overnight camping without the need for significant capital expenditures. It already has power, water, and access.
 - Wildlife disturbance would probably be minimal because the use would be concentrated in a limited area.
- **Potential for Day Use:** If Area A-East is not used for overnight camping, it does offer opportunities for day use facilities or in support of day use activities in other locations. Since the area is already developed, it offers potential for day use capacity expansion without impacting another open space/habitat area. Potential uses could focus on picnicking, both individual and group, and on special events; however, the desirability of the site is reduced because it does not have good, direct access to the water. Another option for the area is to use it for overflow parking and event staging, with shuttles carrying visitors to the other recreation sites.
 - **A Combination of Overnight Camping and Day Use:** Area A-East is certainly large enough that both overnight camping and day use, as discussed above, could be accommodated in different parts of the area. Certainly, concerns surrounding overnight camping would still need to be addressed, and compatibility among candidate uses would need to be assured.

Overnight Use

- **R-13** Do not provide (except proposed Education/Research Center)--due to safety & security concerns; **R-14** Security related to camping; **R-15** Campground is incompatible with the proposed Education/Research Center; **R-16** Keep park day use only to protect wildlife; and **R-17** Provide for overnight use: The primary candidate for overnight camping is Area A-East. Therefore, the perspectives expressed in this set of comments are incorporated in discussion under R-11, above. The only other potential for overnight use is the proposed Education/Research Center, which would include overnight accommodations. However, these would be subject to controlled access and close supervision and do not present the safety, security, and environmental concerns expressed in comments R-13, 14, and 16.

(Planning Team Note: Reclamation's policy is to provide public use as a priority over exclusive/semi-private use where public need is demonstrated. This policy may have relevance in discussions of overnight uses in the RMP area).

Trails & Trail Use

- **R-18** Show on maps: Trails are currently and will continue to be shown on park maps. However, there is a desire for more detailed trail mapping and information, perhaps a specific

trail-related brochure. Trail maps should include mileage information, exact location of features/points of interest, and specific routes that focus on wildlife viewing, bicycling, hiking, etc. (i.e., to the extent that each these uses are accommodated/provided).

- **R-19 Include in planning process**: It was noted that trails were not specifically mentioned as target recreation facilities in the first Newsbrief. The RMP definitely needs to address trails, as highlighted under the issue statements below. Trail uses that need to be considered and accommodated as much as possible include hiking, jogging, bicycling, and equestrian. Trails will be shown on RMP maps.
- **R-20 New dirt road/lane for recreation users, parallel to road, R-22 Increase trail development; and R-23 Complete trail loop (a safety, as well as recreation, issue)**: AHWG discussion focused on the provision of a loop trail around the lake. In this regard, the ideal would be to have a continuous, multi-use loop trail, with complete separation from the County road. Where complete separation is not possible, a wide (i.e., 7+ feet), dedicated trail lane parallel to (and on the lake side of) the road should be provided. Overall, this loop trail should be wide enough and aligned to accommodate multiple user groups (e.g., hiking, jogging, bicycling--for perspectives on equestrian use of the trail, see R-21).

The County has worked to provide such a continuous loop trail but has routed portions of this loop along the County road due to cost, environmental, and physical constraints (e.g., slopes, creeks, ravines). Where the path parallels the road, the County has also been making improvements to the “bike lane” designation, including shoulder improvements.

User groups noted that the situation still needs improvement. Conflicts with motorists still occur where the trail lane parallels the road, especially along segments where motorists park in the lane during peak times (e.g., Area A-East). Overall, the RMP should explore ways of better achieving the ideal described above, building on what the County has already done. The solution may be a combination of additional facility development/improvement and better enforcement of traffic and parking regulations.

(Planning Team Note: As noted above, AHWG discussion focused on a main loop trail facility at Hagg Lake. It is assumed that the Group did not intend to preclude other, more area- or use-specific trail segments, such as nature trails or other such “sub-loops.” Other comments and discussions herein, including the general sentiment expressed by R-22 and comments that encourage nature interpretation, suggest that trail opportunities are not limited to or exclusively focused on the main loop trail.)

- **R-21 Provide equestrian trail(s)**: Considerable public input has been received supporting equestrian trail uses in the RMP study area. Equestrian use is currently not allowed in the park. Certainly, this could be a valid use at the park, assuming that it can be provided in a manner that does not induce unacceptable conflicts or physical impacts, affect water quality, or involve prohibitive costs (whether capital or resource). AHWG members note that there are several problems that would need to be resolved if equestrian uses are to be accommodated. These include:
 - Adding equestrian use to a mix of bicyclists, joggers, and hikers tends to cause compatibility conflicts, especially between bicyclists and equestrians.
 - The land base at the park may not be sufficient (i.e., simply not enough room) to allow development of a separate equestrian trail system; in addition, it is questionable whether there

is sufficient room in many areas to widen the existing trail sufficiently to mitigate user conflicts.

- Cost is a significant constraint whether the equestrian uses are accommodated on the main, multi-use trail or are provided via a separate trail. There are 28 trail bridges across ravines and creeks at the park, none of which are currently designed to support the weight of horses. Existing trail segments would need to be upgraded to handle horses (ie better base and surface materials). Also, increased cost for maintenance and repair would accompany this use; certainly, it would need to be restricted to dry times of year (i.e., July through September) to minimize trail damage.
- Providing parking and staging for equestrian users would also be a cost and land availability challenge.
- The presence of horses in the park could impact water quality.

Despite these challenges, the RMP should explore the potential for accommodating equestrian uses. Equestrian groups have expressed the willingness and desire to participate in meeting the challenges listed above.

- **R-24 Improve trail maintenance & clean-up:** Increased regularity and continuity of trail clean-up is needed. From the County's standpoint, funding for staff time is an issue. Volunteers, community groups, and user groups are a potential source of assistance; for example, PUMP (Portland United Mountain Pedalers) currently does trail maintenance. However, volunteer/user group efforts have not been very reliable or sufficiently regular in the past. The RMP should nevertheless investigate the potential to more actively and reliably involve clubs, community groups, and user groups (such as anglers, as well as hikers, bicyclists, etc.) in meeting this need. It would certainly be appropriate to have the people who contribute to the need for clean-up actually do the clean-up.

Concessions

- **R-25 Need more information on type, demand, characteristics... etc;** and **R-26 Concern for impact of permanent concessions--i.e., over-development & commercialization:** Discussed under R-1, above.

Boating

- **R-27 Establish non-motorized zone on the lake:** Establishing a non-motorized zone would be desirable for some user groups, including those using canoes and kayaks. Due to the small size of the lake, annual drawdown conditions, and the level of demand for motorized boating, further partitioning of the water surface into different use zones may not be practical. If a non-motorized zone were considered, it would most logically be centered on one of the arms (e.g., the Northwest/Scoggins Creek arm). However, reservoir drawdown each year reduces the extent of the water surface in the arms, with some, such as Scoggins Creek, reduced to stream channels by July. Also, the arms are the most popular fishing locations, with motorized boats being the primary mode of gaining fishing access. These factors argue against establishing a non-motorized zone.

Under any circumstances, changes in boating regulations or zoning on the Lake would require approval of the Marine Board.

- **R-28 Inadequate enforcement of no-wake zone:** Enforcement of use/speed restrictions is a challenge on every lake in the state. The RMP should directly address boating enforcement needs, including personnel and funding requirements; the marine board, Sheriff, and Coast Guard should provide leadership in identifying need and solutions. See also M-7 and M-8.
- **R-29 Provide specific kayak/canoe access:** Provision of a launch ramp exclusively for use by non-motorized boaters has been suggested and should be considered. The C-Ramp/Cove area has been suggested as a candidate location for this ramp. See R-27 for discussion of the potential for a non-motorized boating zone on the lake.
- **R-30 Boat ramp for non-motorized craft (perhaps near C-Ramp):** See R-27 and R-29.
- **R-31 Exclude small, motorized craft in arms of the lake:** See R-27.
- **R-32 More buoys along buoy line:** This sounds like a good, inexpensive action to assist with better enforcement of boating restrictions on the lake. Additional buoys would be coordinated through the Marine Board and Sheriff's Department.

Fishing

- **R-33 Pursue year-round opportunity:** A year-round fishing season is no longer being considered by the managing agencies at the park. This is due to issues of operations and maintenance cost to the County for keeping the park open all year, public safety, and stress to the resources of the park. However, in response to public demand for longer access to the park for fishing, the season will be expanded in 2002 from 6 months to 9 months. The season will now be March through November.
(Extended season is also discussed under M-23 through 25)
- **R-34 Facilities for boat and bank fishing:** It is assumed that the comment refers to providing additional docks and platforms for use by anglers. Given that fishing is, by far, the most popular use at Hagg Lake, accommodations/facilities to support this use should definitely be considered. As options are reviewed for providing additional opportunities, accessibility to those with disabilities must be a consideration (see A-10).
- **R-35 Need fish cleaning stations:** There are currently no fish cleaning stations at the park. Providing stations at key locations would be beneficial from a convenience standpoint as well as helping to promote waste management and protect water quality. Any fish cleaning stations provided would need to be easy to operate and not include fish grinders as these tend to be a maintenance problem.

Other Uses

- **R-36 Pursue the Tualatin Watershed Education & Research Center:** There is general agreement that the proposed Education/Research Center should be supported, especially given R-38.
- **R-37 Pursue other education opportunities:** Yes, including interpretive signage and pamphlets, etc.
- **R-38 Provide community center use within the proposed Education/Research Center:** Community center uses are provided in the proposed design of the Education/Research Center.

- **R-39 Provide alcohol-free area at the lake:** County ordinance currently allows alcoholic beverages in County parks. Changes to this ordinance would be required (assuming there is sufficient public support for these changes). However, such an initiative is not within the scope of Reclamation's RMP. If a "dry" area is considered, the proposed Education/Research Center may be the best candidate.

Access, Parking, and Surrounding Uses

Roads

- **A-1 Maintain County roads; concern for landslides, etc:** Maintenance of the County road system in the study area is a long-standing challenge, one that will continue into the future. Road maintenance priorities are set by the County, and it is believed that the status of the roads in the study area within the County's matrix of priorities is appropriate.
- **A-2 Too much traffic; A-3 Balance of commercial vs. recreational use of roads; A-4 Conflicts between local use of roads and special events; A-5 No parking in bike lane (related topics, discussed together herein):** Relatively unrestricted access to and multiple use of the road system through the park is a reality. Traffic congestion and spill-over parking along the County road (e.g. parking in the bike lane) do occur during peak use times at the park. The A-ramp area is an example where traffic congestion and over-capacity conditions occur most often. These and other traffic-related conflicts cause both enforcement and user safety concerns.

To manage the situation, more needs to be known about the volumes and timing of various types of traffic. For example, the current volume of commercial traffic is not known. A review of traffic volumes, types, timing, capacity, and safety needs should be conducted for the whole park, including how best to continue accommodating the multiple uses of the road. The review should include uses such as local vehicular traffic, general park users, special events at the park, logging trucks and other commercial traffic, bicyclists and runners, etc.

Certainly, issues such as parking in the bike lane or other such conflicts can be addressed through better enforcement of existing regulations. However, we must recognize that the park will have limits on how much activity and visitation it can accommodate. Placing limits on use may need to be considered, along with active and effective management and enforcement efforts.

One solution that may warrant consideration is installation of a controlled-access gate system for the park as a whole. Currently, local residents, motorists "just passing through", and park users attempting to avoid paying the user fees, are able to bypass the park entry booths. Establishing a controlled access system, wherein local residents would use key cards to enter the area and all others would need to pass through the WACO entry booths, would provide several advantages, including allowing WACO to:

- Better manage traffic and parking problems and avoid over-use of facilities during hours the park is open by closing off public access when park facilities reach capacity (i.e. "Park Full" notification at the entry booths);
- Eliminate the need to devote enforcement resources to pursuing park users who bypass the entry booths in an attempt to avoid paying the user fees; and,

- Address enforcement concerns during hours of the day or times of the year when the park is closed by simply closing access to all but residents with card keys. Benefits in this regard would apply to managing both unauthorized uses within the park and problems such as poaching on adjacent private lands.

If this option is considered for the RMP, its acceptability to local residents and justification from the standpoint of general public use of County roads must be carefully reviewed.

- **A-6 New dirt "lane" for runners & bikes...keep off the road**: Certainly, such a facility would be desirable. However, developing a separate recreation "lane," continuous around the lake, would be costly (e.g., in land requirement, bridges/stream crossings, etc.). The feasibility of such a facility is questionable.

Parking

- **A-7 Increase capacity/areas as use increases; and A-8 Better parking both along the highway and at boat ramps**: Clearly, provision of adequate parking must be a goal of the RMP effort. Parking must be provided to safely, efficiently, and conveniently (to the extent possible) accommodate peak use periods. As discussions proceed related to the carrying capacity of the park, parking may be a factor, along with traffic volumes on the roads, balancing natural resource protection needs, etc.

Ideas for better accommodating parking needs include:

- Providing off-site or peripheral parking/staging areas, with shuttles taking people to recreation sites. This may be applicable particularly to special events. Perhaps a grant could be obtained to fund a "ride connection" (volunteer shuttle) program.
- Re-opening and re-configuring Area A-East to provide more parking.

Shoreline/Bank Access

- **A-9 Improve shoreline access; but control damage**: Public access to the shoreline should be improved as much as possible to reduce hazards and improve safety. However, this must be done within the constraints of: [1] water surface fluctuations due to reservoir operations, and [2] resource protection needs. Provision of shoreline access must also recognize liability concerns. Appropriate signage guiding visitors to designated access locations and warning of safety concerns could be part of the solution. It was also noted that alcohol-related accidents do occur, associated with getting into and out of the water; appropriate public education/information and enforcement are part of the approach to this issue.

Accessibility

- **A-10 Adequacy of accessibility of facilities for persons with disabilities, including fishing uses**: Reclamation and WACO have a responsibility under Federal regulations to provide accommodation for disabled persons in all development, as much as feasible; WACO has done an excellent job doing this to date, in part through cost share agreements with Reclamation.

Surrounding Uses

- **A-11 No hunting or firearms in adjacent areas**; and, **A-12 Trespassing**: Local residents indicate that illegal hunting and shooting on private property surrounding the park is a serious concern. This is a County law enforcement issue since access to private property is obtained from the County road, and, perhaps through park property. Increased management of access to the park environs may also be part of the solution (see A-2 through A-5, above).
- **A-13 Forestry practices; impacts (erosion/sedimentation, visual) of logging**: Forest harvest activity is an important use in the watershed surrounding the park (the only forest harvest which occurs in the RMP area itself is thinning). A cooperative effort is needed on a continuing basis to manage forestry, farming, and other land-disturbing activities in the surrounding watershed. All such activities have potential implications for the water quality of the lake and the visual quality of park area. Currently, the Tualatin River Watershed Council and WACO provide the leadership in such efforts.

Management and Implementation

Reservoir Operations

- **M-1 Avoid RMP impact on operations, especially within the TVID/Reclamation zone (as mapped)**: It has been clearly noted, as an RMP “sideboard,” that reservoir operations are not a part of the RMP effort, and care will be taken to ensure that RMP proposals/programs/actions do not have an adverse effect on operations. Specific to operations facilities, the Reclamation zone, including the area surrounding and downstream of the dam, should be shown on RMP maps; the history and functions of this zone can be a subject of public information materials.
- **M-2 Consider safety & security issues at/below dam**: This concern was not discussed at length by the AHWG. It is self-explanatory; the RMP will address safety and security at and surrounding the dam and associated facilities.

Study Area Data

- **M-3 Gather data from other sources/studies for use in RMP**; **M-4 Establish inventory/database, specifically for Hagg Lake (e.g., natural resources)**; **M-5 Work with educational partners**; and **M-6 Do not trust County's 1999 study--flawed; biased toward picnicking; not inclusive of current users**: These ideas and concerns are considered self-explanatory, not requiring substantial discussion. The RMP effort will use existing data sources and studies to the maximum credible extent and will compile resource inventory, user data, and other information relevant to both the present planning effort and to continuing management of the study area. Educational partners in these efforts are represented on the AHWG, and no one source of information (such as the 1999 Recreation Users Study) will be allowed to unduly influence decision-making.

Health, Safety, & Security

- **M-7 Increase law enforcement presence**: Increased law enforcement presence in the west part of the County, including the study area, has been a concern; recently, the number of officers on patrol has been increased from one to two, with more officers available and provided during

weekends and other busy periods. The adequacy of this staffing level into the future should be considered related to the needs of the study area and its surroundings. As noted above, for example, if overnight camping is considered for the park, it is strongly felt that increased attention to law enforcement presence will be warranted.

Specific to the water surface of the lake, increased law enforcement presence is needed due to the intensity and density of use. This concern will increase over time as/if visitation to the park grows. Perhaps a return to the prior staffing level (one marine deputy and one Explorer) would be a step in the right direction.

(Planning Team Note: We should add clarification of the term “Explorer” as used by the WACO Sheriff.)

- **M-8 Stronger Coast Guard Auxiliary presence:** Coast Guard Auxiliary presence at the lake is voluntary. The number of hours currently volunteered should be verified, and the potential for increasing this very positive presence should be explored as part of any solution to safety, enforcement, and patrol concerns.
- **M-9 Concerns include fire, police, hunting, firearms, and vandalism:** The issue of overall law enforcement presence is discussed above. Specific to the concerns expressed in this comment, the following points are relevant:
 - Hunting and loaded firearms are currently prohibited in the study area (i.e., thus, an enforcement concern).
 - Vandalism has occurred and will continue to require patrol and enforcement attention.
 - The RMP effort should reflect the status of emergency actions plans for fire management and protection around the lake. Currently, only barbeque grills are allowed in the park; open fires are prohibited. Also, the public should be aware that firefighters may need access to the lake as a water source in fighting fires on either park lands or adjacent private property.
- **M-10 Inadequate enforcement of rules pertaining to hunting & ORV use:** Self-explanatory--see M-7 and M-9, above.
- **M-11 Response to 911 calls (there are many); and associated costs (need for funding):** The County currently has an agreement with the Gaston Fire Department for response to 911 calls. This arrangement is working well, and the service provided by the Fire Department is considered very good. The only concern for the RMP is the likelihood that any significant increase in visitation to the park will result in a corresponding increase in 911 calls, and thus an increase in costs that must be covered.
- **M-12 Wireless phone coverage needed:** It is generally agreed that better wireless phone coverage is desirable in the study area and its surroundings. Such coverage would be of benefit for 911 calls, as well as valley residents, businesses, and agencies in general.

(Planning Team Note: Efforts to enhance wireless phone coverage in the study area have previously included discussion of possibly placing a relay tower/antenna on Reclamation land in the Southwest part of the RMP area. No request was made officially for a site on Reclamation land; and the project proponents began seeking a site on private land outside of the RMP area. The RMP process should investigate and report on the status of these efforts. Beyond whatever potential might exist for pursuing discussion of locating the needed tower on Reclamation land, it is not likely that the RMP

process can directly seek to provide or improve wireless phone service in the study area. However, the RMP can include an objective to work with the County and other interested parties, within the bounds of Reclamation's mission and authority, to obtain this service. A permit for this purpose would require the vendor to lease the land at fair market value.)

- **M-13** General concern regarding trash/garbage, especially along the shoreline: Trash along the road, within the park, and along the shoreline is an ongoing issue. Currently, the Sheriff conducts clean-ups along the road as part of the community corrections program; perhaps the RMP, through the County, can investigate the feasibility of an "adopt-a-highway" program for the study area to supplement these efforts. In all cases, enforcement, public information/signage, and provision of adequate trash receptacles are all part of the solution.
- **M-14** Better/more restrooms & trash receptacles; and **M-15** Provide adequate sanitation/waste facilities commensurate with increased recreation development: Self-explanatory. Beyond the points made under M-13, above, no specific focal locations for these concerns were identified during AHWG discussion; these issues will be addressed as an integral part of the RMP process.

Public Information

- **M-16** Need more complete website for park--rules, reservations, wildlife viewing, trails, other links, etc: The amount and type of information on the County's park website should be improved, including information on scheduled events, links to Reclamation information on water elevation/reservoir operations, trails information, use regulations, natural resource interpretation, and others. The RMP should encourage improvement of the County's website as much as feasible in this regard. Also, the desirability of maintaining (i.e., after RMP completion) the current link between Reclamation's RMP website and WACO should be explored.
- **M-17** Need specific trails-related brochure: Discussed under R-18, above.
- **M-18** Better signage & education for users regarding clean-up responsibilities--especially bank fishers & boaters: As discussed under M-13, above, signage/public education is definitely a component of any program to improve trash/waste management conditions.
- **M-19** Interpretive signage program, including the dam: The desirability of providing interpretative signage on a number of topics has been noted in several places herein, including natural resources, cultural resources, and dam and reservoir history, facilities, and operations.
- **M-20** Signage master plan to improve signage overall--new designs, better legibility, accessibility; use public involvement & volunteer resources: Given the number and variety of references made in other discussions to the role of signage, it seems clear that the need and potential for a coordinated signage plan should be considered as part of the RMP process.

Fees/Fee Structure

- **M-21** Appropriate for (increased) use levels: One half of the park's budget comes from the fees paid by users; and the County is responsible for setting fee levels. Clearly, this source of revenue will continue to be important, especially since Reclamation does not cost-share operations and maintenance of these facilities.

Funding & Implementation

(Planning Team Note: Item numbering under this heading has changed. The first issue/concern was inadvertently not given a number in the original matrix. Thus, previously numbered items M-22 through M-26 are now numbered M-23-through M-27; also, item M-28 has been added by Reclamation to clarify funding and implementation questions related to the proposed Education/Research Center).

- **M-22** Funding of RMP programs/facilities: It has been noted in RMP presentations and publications to date that Reclamation is required by regulation to have cost-sharing non-Federal public managing partners to provide funding for facilities. This requirement is for a 50/50 cost share partner in developing any new recreation facilities, and a 75-Federal/25-non-Federal partner for fish and wildlife enhancements.

Up to this point in time, the County has relied on timber revenues to fund its 50% share of recreation development at the park. The County no longer has this source of revenue available for park development and does not envision such funds being available for at least the next 7 years. As a result, funding will be an important issue for any RMP development proposals.

Potential new sources the County should investigate include the Community Development Block Grant program, and, if overnight camping is made available, State RV grant funds. It is estimated these funds could provide as much as \$80,000 per year. Also, use of volunteers should be explored wherever feasible; volunteer labor and/or materials could be enlisted for trail development/maintenance and other purposes.

- **M-23** Look at implications of increased season of use; **M-24** Impacts to resources (e.g., elk) of extended season or year-round fishing; and **M-25** Funding for operations, enforcement, & management during extended season: As noted above, 2002 will be the first year of an extended season for the park, extending the period the park is open from 6 to 9 months. During the additional months the park will be open, it will be open to all uses; this will require an increase in seasonal staff, additional fee collectors, and other associated costs to the County. It is uncertain whether use levels, and thus user fee revenues, will be sufficient to offset the additional costs of maintaining the extended season over the long term. For example, while fishing and bike trail usage may take advantage of the extended season, other uses, such as boating and picnicking, may be minimal because of weather, bridge closures, etc. The County will be monitoring this situation to determine if the extended season is feasible.

(Planning Team Note: The potential for impact of the extended season on the natural resources of the study area was not discussed in depth by the AHWG. However, the RMP process will review and consider the potential for such impacts, as well as consider this perspective in formulating recommendations regarding season of use during the 10-year horizon of the Plan. This will also include reviewing the concerns of time of day and season of use patterns for special events and how these affect natural resources.)

- **M-26** RMP and water study; and **M-27** Consider impacts of dam-raising possibility--loss of land, do not waste taxpayers money:

(Planning Team Note: The relationship between the RMP and the water supply feasibility study was not discussed by the AHWG. This is because the relationship between the two studies was clarified by earlier Planning Team presentations (i.e., at both the public meeting and earlier during the AHWG

meeting). In brief, it is recognized that the water supply feasibility study could recommend raising Scoggins Dam as part of its preferred alternative. Obviously, such an action would impact the entire park, including current recreation sites. However, if raising the dam is actually pursued, the process leading to physical construction will most likely take 10 or more years to complete. During that time, management of the park and its resources cannot stand still. Facility renovations and improvements and actions to address use/management issues need to continue. The RMP process will clearly keep in mind the potential effects of raising the dam and will consider this potential in all decisions related to facility development, especially those requiring any significant capital improvements. In general, any new facilities proposed in the RMP will be either: [1] low cost, temporary, or easily moveable; or [2] above the potential future waterline of the modified reservoir.)

- **M-28** Reclamation's relationship with and requirements for the proposed Education/Research Center:

(Planning Team Note: If the Education/Research Center proposal goes forward, Reclamation would not cost-share construction, operations, and maintenance; however, a land use agreement would be required with the project proponents, specifying terms and conditions governing this use.)