
Appendix A
Problem Statement
for the RMP



Lake Cascade Resource Management Plan (RMP) Update Problem Statement

INTRODUCTION

This is a two part document that has been prepared to serve the following purposes in support of the Resource Management Plan (RMP) Update effort:

- Summarize the full list of issues and opportunities identified and compiled from the public involvement process to date, including comments received: (1) during the first set of public meetings held in Boise and Cascade on 10 and 11 February 1999, respectively; (2) the mail-in response forms in the January 1999 Newsbrief; (3) from the discussions at the first four Ad Hoc Work Group (AHWG) meetings (April 28, July 8, September 23, and October 14, 1999); and (4) from other discussions with individuals or agencies.
- Assess how the existing RMP Goals and Objectives relate to the list of issues and opportunities identified for the Update process. In this regard, for example, the existing RMP does contain appropriate provisions to address key issues faced in the current planning effort; however, it appears that implementation and enforcement of these provisions has not been altogether effective (thus, issues and opportunities which were faced in the existing RMP effort still require attention). In other cases, the current planning effort faces concerns that were not foreseen or dealt with in the existing RMP.
- Serve as a foundation for translating the issues and opportunities into either: (1) potential goals, objectives, or actions for the RMP, or (2) alternative courses of action to be considered in the draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the RMP Update.

As noted above, this document is presented in two parts. These are described in further detail below:

This Problem Statement has taken the list of issues and opportunities assembled from the public involvement process, together with insight from the Planning Team, and organized it into the following discussions and notes:

Discussions: These summaries reflect public and agency discussion on the particular issues to date. When combined with the original issue/opportunity statements themselves, they are intended to provide an overview of public opinions. This material will serve as one key basis for assessing the relevance and effectiveness of the existing RMP and for defining alternatives and changes for the RMP update.

Planning Team Notes: These notes are intended to provide: (1) references to the Goals, Objectives, and actions of the existing RMP which relate to the problem statement under discussion; (2) some assessment of the existing RMP's effectiveness in addressing each issue/opportunity; (3) insight into RMP changes or new alternatives which may need to be considered in the RMP Update process to more fully address the issue/opportunity; or (4) determination that the issue will be removed from the RMP Update process. **Important:** These notes are not intended to be comprehensive nor to suggest that conclusions or decisions have been reached. They are intended only to provide information relevant in assessing the adequacy of the existing RMP and determining needs for the RMP Update.

The Problem Statement has been organized according to the following major- and sub-topics:

- A. Natural and Cultural Resources
 - (1) Wildlife and Vegetation Management; (2) Erosion, Sedimentation, and Water Quality; (3) Cultural Resources; and (4) General.
- B. Recreation
 - (1) General; (2) Boating and Other Water Uses; and (3) Land-based Activities.
- C. Other Land Uses & Land Management
 - (1) General Land Use & Environmental Character; (2) Conservation & Open Space Areas; (3) Agriculture & Grazing; (4) Crown Point; and (5) Surrounding Land Use/Management.
- D. Operation, Management, and Implementation
 - (1) Reservoir Operations & Management; (2) Access; (3) Management, Coordination, and Regulation (4) Implementation; and (5) Surrounding Land Use/Management.

A. NATURAL & CULTURAL RESOURCES

Problem Statements: **A.1 – Wildlife & Vegetation Management**

Issue Category: **A.1.1 – Protection/Enhancement of Wildlife Habitat**

Specific Issue – Wetlands; Bald Eagle Nesting/Foraging; Enforcement of No Wake Zone in Wildlife Management Areas

Discussions: Ensure compliance with all applicable laws and regulations related to wildlife and habitat protection (including wetlands and threatened or endangered species of animals or plants); Protect/maintain all existing WMAs as designated in the existing RMP, including land access and boating restrictions (i.e., no motorized land access and no-wake or non-motorized boating, respectively); Explore means of properly marking and enforcing boating restriction zones in WMAs, including:

- Explore buoy options; and
- Consider use of “distance from shore” designations as an alternative to fixed lines on RMP mapping.

Planning Team Notes: The above concerns are addressed in Goals & Objectives of the existing RMP (existing RMP Goal 1.1). Objectives under this goal will need to be revised, as appropriate through the RMP Update process, to: (1) include a consideration for conservation, restoration and enhancement of native habitats in all planning decisions (per the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes' Snake River Basin Policy); (2) reflect continuation, rather than initial formation, of the WMAs; (3) specify continuation of land and water access restrictions; and (4) contain more detail regarding how no-wake and non-motorized boating restrictions will be marked and enforced. It should be noted, however, that conflicting points of view exist regarding continuation of WMA land access restrictions without modification. Issue Categories: B.3.6 (ORV Use) and C.1.1 (Re-Evaluate Designations of Areas), elsewhere herein, suggest that limited motorized access should be considered for the WMAs. Both of these points of view can be considered in the RMP Update alternatives.

Issue Category: A.1.2 – Fishery (habitat management/improvement, perch fishery)

Discussions: Support efforts to manage & improve the fishery; relevant efforts include:

- Water quality improvement plans and programs in conjunction with Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ);
- Retention of high water levels (RMP should designate minimum pool targets for each season, including 300,000 acre-feet in the winter, and 450,000 acre-feet in the summer);
- Avoidance of spillway releases; and
- Enhancement/creation of fish habitat in conjunction with Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG).

Provide parking areas for ice fishing and generally improve both vehicular and walk-in access to fishing areas (i.e., in addition to established recreation sites); and consider potential for fishing piers.

Candidate locations include:

- Sugarloaf recreation site,
- South of the golf course (Big Sage recreation site);
- Poison Creek recreation area and Mallard Bay;
- Gold Fork arm; and
- Church Camp and Campbell Creek areas on U.S. Forest Service (USFS) lands
Blue Heron

Planning Team Notes: Protection and enhancement of fishery resources are the subject of Goal 1.4 in the existing RMP. Objectives under this goal address water quality improvement, retention of a special use pool to protect the fishery, and cooperation with IDFG in managing the fishery. The above discussions suggest the avoidance of spillway releases; however, this suggestion may not be applicable to the RMP, given that reservoir operations are not part of the planning process. Nevertheless, the RMP process could include clarification of how releases could be modified to better protect fishery resources; perhaps modifications to the methods of release are possible, such as using the high pressure gates instead of the spillway for releases, even if requirements for the amount or timing of releases are relatively fixed. This potential should be discussed with responsible Reclamation personnel.

Regarding winter fishing access/parking and general provision of fishing-oriented recreation locations, the existing RMP contains a only a general objective centered on winter activities (Objective 2.2.11); however, this objective contains no detail and no supporting program in the RMP. The existing RMP does not include a program of providing specific fishing locations around the lake, separate from general recreation sites. Thus, suggestions such as those noted above should be added if they are desirable in the RMP Update. It should be noted that Campbell Creek (USFS) lands are not part of the RMP Update.

Issue Category: A.1.3 – Vegetation Control

Specific Issue – Weed/Algae Control (Aquatic and Terrestrial)

Discussions: The primary aquatic weed problem is Northern milfoil, with the worst concentrations occurring in Boulder Creek. Both this and the algae problems occurring in several areas of the reservoir stem from the nutrient management problems being addressed by DEQ. Short-term management approaches to the milfoil problem include physical removal and chemical treatments. The latter may be effective and acceptable if used when the plants are just beginning to appear (i.e., not much growth or biomass); however, after the plants have grown to the point of being a problem, use of chemical treatments is not desirable, since the plant biomass remains in the reservoir and contributes to the nutrient management problem.

The best approach to aquatic weed issues in the RMP will be to reaffirm and support DEQ's water quality improvement program. If short term treatment of milfoil is needed, physical removal is the preferred method, with chemical treatments used only with approval of DEQ.

The primary terrestrial weed problem cited in discussion is Russian knapweed, Canadian thistle, and the possibility of Eurasian milfoil. DEQ and Reclamation are studying this problem, with a priority on non-chemical solutions.

Planning Team Notes: Aquatic and terrestrial weed control were not addressed in the goals and objectives of the existing RMP. The only reference to either of these concerns is a statement contained in the document which calls for continuing "the on-going noxious weed control program with Valley County". Reclamation has responsibility for controlling weeds on Reclamation lands and has a contract with Valley County for weed control. The RMP Update can respond to the above concerns by including objectives (and associated implementation programs) which: (1) support the DEQ's water quality improvement plans for the reservoir (i.e., Phase II Watershed Management Plan [December 1998] and the Total maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Implementation Plan [due to be released soon]); (2) encourage cooperative efforts between DEQ and Reclamation to conduct physical removal for milfoil control (all under DEQ supervision); and (3) provide for continuing focus by DEQ, Reclamation, and Valley County on maintaining existing and/or instituting new terrestrial weed control programs (BOR will not be doing chemical treatment due to water quality concerns).

Issue Category: A.1.4 – Public Input Needed for Wetland Projects

Discussions: It is likely that any public issue regarding wetland projects is related to cases where these projects are adjacent to private lands. The RMP should be more clear in identifying where wetland projects are planned to occur. Such identification need not be at a site-specific scale; rather, for example, at the scale of WMAs or parts of WMAs. Reclamation should also consider a more visible public information program related to wetland projects. The proper forum for providing information on and discussing wetland projects is the WAG (Watershed Advisory Group), or its TAC (Technical Advisory Committee). It is suggested that public notification include a direct mailing to potentially affected landowners, and that one way to keep the public informed is to hold an annual RMP implementation meeting during which projects planned for the coming year would be reviewed.

Planning Team Notes: Objectives 1.1.4 and 1.1.6 of the existing RMP address protection, enhancement and restoration of wetlands and riparian areas around the reservoir. The RMP also contains a general list of implementation actions for each WMA. Based on the above points made by the public, additional detail should be contained in the RMP Update regarding (1) a more defined program of actions anticipated to meet these objectives, and (2) ensuring that public involvement and notification, under the auspices of the WAG/TAC is conducted if these actions could have an impact on surrounding landowners (i.e., due to physical land disturbance, access interruptions, etc.).

Issue Category: A.1.5 – Mosquito Control on West Mountain

Discussions: Mosquito control is under the jurisdiction of the county; Reclamation does not currently engage in this activity. Residents who wish to pursue mosquito abatement must work with the County to form a special district. Specific areas cited in which mosquito abatement is a need include, but are not limited to: Boulder Creek and Rainbow Point campground.

Planning Team Notes: The existing RMP calls for Reclamation preparation of an insect control plan for the reservoir, in association with involved agencies and affected landowners. In this case, the existing RMP is not accurate in addressing the insect control issue. As noted above mosquito abatement is within Valley County's jurisdiction, therefore, related programs must be developed and implemented by the county and affected subdivisions or homeowners groups. Any proposed insect control on Reclamation's lands would require approval by Reclamation. The RMP can include an objective or action which confirms Reclamation's willingness to cooperate with the county in developing and implementing needed programs for Reclamation lands. It should be noted that Rainbow Point is not on Reclamation lands.

Issue Category: A.1.6 – Tribal Hunting & Gathering Rights/Activities on Reclamation Lands

Discussions: The Tribes have requested the following: (1) tribal rights to hunt, fish, and gather plants on Reclamation lands be recognized and provided for in the RMP; (2) a separate section on hunting and gathering be included in the RMP, within the Cultural Resources section; and (3) these tribal rights also

appear, as uses that Reclamation will be managing for, in the goals and objectives of specific vegetation and wildlife sections of the RMP.

For further insight, see Issue Categories A.3.2 (Addressing Cultural Resource Responsibilities, Enforcement, and Education—Proper Attention to Cultural Resources in All Management Actions) and A.4.2 (Inclusion of Tribes' Snake River Policy in RMP), below.

Planning Team Notes: The existing RMP does not address this concern. Specific objectives, actions, and associated programs will need to be drafted to address these issues, based on specific treaty rights and legal responsibilities.

Problem Statements: A.2 – Erosion, Sedimentation, and Water Quality

Issue Category: A.2.1 – Protect/Enhance Water Quality

Specific Issues –

- Quantify point/non-point sources of pollution at Cascade*
- Cooperative efforts with surrounding land owners to protect water quality*
- Eliminate septic systems at public use areas--install sewers*
- Restrict phosphate release in Gold Fork*
- Effects of pesticide use*

Discussions: Overall, the RMP Update should incorporate by reference or otherwise provide support for DEQ's water quality improvement program for Lake Cascade and should describe the relationship of this program to Clean Water Act requirements (including Reclamation's responsibilities under that Act). The DEQ program, which encompasses the activities of the Cascade Reservoir Coordinating Council (i.e., the official WAG), addresses all water quality concerns noted in public comment (as listed above). Specific actions in the DEQ program which are applicable to Reclamation lands around the reservoir should be addressed in the RMP's goals and objectives. The primary ways in which the RMP can assist in addressing the water quality problem at Cascade are as follows:

- Reaffirm Reclamation's commitment to participate in the WAG process and to remain abreast of WAG activities, problems, and progress;
- Maintain and enhance existing wetlands and riparian vegetation;
- Where possible, remove cattle grazing from the shore zone and continue cooperative efforts with agricultural easement holders to implement fencing programs, including providing material or cost share support;
- Improve campground sanitary facilities—work with DEQ to establish priorities for facility replacements and upgrades, including connection of recreation sites to sewer systems when feasible;
- Continue to try to acquire land or agricultural easements to preclude shoreline grazing; and
- Develop and implement effective shoreline erosion control measures.

In addition, Reclamation is concerned about conditions on lands and in streams outside of Federal ownership around the reservoir. Priority concerns in this regards include:

- Use of fertilizers, herbicides and pesticides on adjacent lands, as well as situations where such use is actually occurring on Reclamation lands;
- The need to implement sewer systems for all residences within a quarter mile of the reservoir; and
- Monitoring of streams entering the reservoir.

Planning Team Notes: Goal 1.2 and associated objectives in the existing RMP address water quality concerns, including most of the items listed above which are directly applicable to Reclamation lands (the exception is wetlands and riparian areas, which are addressed under Goal 1.1). The RMP Update should carry forward this goal and its objectives (revised appropriately to emphasize the leadership of DEQ, the WAG/TAC also called Cascade Reservoir Coordinating Council and the Cascade Reservoir Association (CRA); and to reiterate the importance of wetlands and riparian areas). However, given the emphasis being placed by the public on defining and prioritizing specific action programs aimed at achieving RMP goals and objectives, additional detail should be developed in each case defining alternatives to address the “what, when, and how” for each objective. Also, the RMP Update should include objectives and/or actions which confirm Reclamation’s active involvement with the WAG, and support DEQ’s ongoing water quality efforts.

Issue Category: A.2.2 – Address Shoreline Erosion/Erosion Control

*Specific Issues – Retaining walls should be Reclamation's responsibility
Prohibit use of RR ties for erosion control*

Discussions: Installation of shoreline erosion control measures, in existing RR areas where Reclamation holds a flowage easement, will remain primarily the responsibility of adjacent landowners. Reclamation will issue a permit to adjacent owners to construct approved erosion control measures; but the agency will not implement these measures unless they are specifically associated with protecting a public use area or resource (e.g. at the Boulder Creek and Huckleberry recreation sites). In the limited instances where Reclamation does not have a flowage easement and impacts to private land are imminent, Reclamation will evaluate on a case by case basis to determine appropriate action.

The RMP Update will need to include necessary policies and programs to directly address each of these situations. Regarding the efforts of adjacent landowners, the revised RMP can help address the erosion control problem in RR areas in the following ways:

- Develop and publish (in cooperation with the Corps of Engineers) consistent and effective standards for shoreline erosion control measures, including: engineering standards; water quality standards (e.g., any further use of railroad ties should be prohibited due to water quality concerns; existing railroad ties would remain and replacements would require a different material); aesthetic standards; and biotechnical approaches;
- Develop, publish, and implement (in cooperation with the Corps of Engineers) a consistent and streamlined process for obtaining permit approval for erosion control projects; mitigate the current perception that obtaining a permit is a major bureaucratic challenge. In this regard, it is relevant to clarify that current requirements include: (1) a permit from Reclamation regarding design and construction of the erosion control structures, and (2) a separate permit from the Corps of

Engineers to address the requirements of section 404 of the Clean Water Act—specifically addressing impacts to wetlands and “Waters of the United States”;

- Consider broad-scale permitting activities for entire sections of shoreline, with individual owners needing only to demonstrate compliance with applicable standards; standards compliance could be reviewed by Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers. (Note: AHWG discussion demonstrated considerable support for this action, and included a request that Reclamation and the CRCC provide leadership and help initiate a process to accomplish such broad-scale permitting; Reclamation indicated that this would be considered);
- Explore the feasibility of allowing installations consistent with minimum standards to be accomplished by landowners without needing to obtain a permit (e.g., requiring only Reclamation inspection and approval after construction); in this regard, however, it is noted that the requirement for obtaining a Corp of Engineers Clean Water Act permit and a Reclamation permit will remain a requirement;
- Improve effectiveness of standards enforcement;

(Note: it was also suggested that tax incentives be provided for adjacent landowners to accomplish erosion control; however, Reclamation responded that this is not within the Agency’s jurisdiction).

- Also relevant to the erosion control issue is the suggestion by AHWG members that Reclamation consider keeping the reservoir one foot below full pool as much as possible as a means of minimizing further erosion damage. This issue is discussed further under planing team notes.

Planning Team Notes: Goal 1.3 and associated objectives in the existing RMP address erosion control. Specifically, Objective 1.3.4 anticipates cooperative/coordinated efforts between Reclamation and private landowners in installing erosion control measures; however, it does not provide detail regarding (1) definition of erosion control standards, (2) differing relationships and responsibilities between Reclamation and adjacent landowners where Reclamation has a flowage easement inland of Federal ownership vs. where there is no flowage easement, (3) the role of the Corps of Engineers or the process required for obtaining approval to build erosion control structures, (4) the concept of area-wide (vs. parcel-by-parcel) permitting, or (5) responsibility for enforcing consistency with permitting requirements and design standards. The RMP Update should address each of these concerns through revised objective(s) and associated action programs under the original Goal 1.3 and Objective 1.3.4.

In general, and notwithstanding the above, Reclamation does not plan to pursue a broad-scale program of shoreline erosion control. Exceptions to this will include action on a case-by-case basis at recreation sites, where public safety and/or damage to capital improvements are concerns; and pertaining to instances where no flowage easement exists and damage to private land is imminent.

Regarding the recommendation to keep the reservoir level one foot below full pool as an erosion prevention measure, the existing RMP does not include this type of consideration. Review of this concept suggests that, while it may or may not have a beneficial effect on erosion, depending on the location, it could also involve adverse impacts such as: unacceptable constraints on reservoir operations (i.e., contract deliveries), inducement of unauthorized access to and use of the drawdown

area, the spread of noxious weeds into the drawdown area, and potential water quality impacts due to a reduced pool. For these reasons, it will not be carried forward.

Issue Category: A.2.3 – Location of Sewer Installation

Discussions: Sewer installation is currently regulated by the State’s Central District Health Department; this will not be affected by the RMP Update. The point is made, however, that Reclamation should monitor the progress of sewer system installation around the reservoir and that the recreation sites should be hooked up to sewers wherever feasible.

Planning Team Notes: Sewer system installation, operation and maintenance is addressed by Objective 1.2.6 in the existing RMP (i.e., ensuring proper coordination with Central District Health). A program for progressively hooking up the recreation sites to local sewer systems was not included in the existing RMP.

Issue Category: A.2.4 – Stabilize the Mud Creek Channel

Discussions: Erosion of Mud Creek is a problem identified in current water quality studies. However, the area of concern is privately owned and is not a part of the lands under study in the RMP Update. The RMP can thus only contribute to addressing this issue indirectly, by confirming Reclamation’s participation in the WAG, as addressed above.

Issue Category: A.2.5 – Manage Impoundments Like Grandma's Creek

Discussions: The specific location noted in the comment was not familiar to AHWG members. However, the AHWG did address the idea of creating sub-impoundments at various locations around the reservoir. Small sub-impoundments, or ponding areas, are a part of many of the wetland projects in the WMAs; these are generally beneficial from both water quality and wildlife standpoints. Regarding suggestions for larger sub-impoundments in the North Fork, Lake Fork, or Gold Fork arms of the reservoir, it was noted that studies have been conducted of such actions. Generally, these studies have found that major, year-round sub-impoundments in the arms of the reservoir would have (1) positive effects in terms of waterfowl habitat, but (2) negative impact on water quality (i.e., due to nutrient buildup and increased water temperature). Making such impoundments seasonal has not been studied and could moderate the negative impact while retaining the beneficial effects.

The concept of sub-impoundments should be retained in the RMP, focusing on the smaller implementations associated with wetland projects. Further study of the larger impoundments, with some form of seasonal operation, could also be considered; however, it is noted that such impoundments can involve significant land/water use issues and are most likely cost-prohibitive (i.e., not feasible unless funding sources outside of Reclamation can be identified). In any case, all sub-impoundment concepts and proposals would be subject to review by the WAG and TAC.

Planning Team Notes: Protection and enhancement of ponding areas associated with wetlands are inherently included in the above discussions and in objectives of the existing RMP. However the

concept of major sub-impoundments, seasonal or year-round is not addressed in the existing RMP and will not be carried forward into the Update due to the infeasible costs.

Problem Statements: A.3 – Cultural Resources

Planning Team Notes for Issue Categories A.3.1 - A.3.4, below: The existing RMP does not contain Goals and Objectives addressing Cultural Resources; however, the RMP (Section 5.4.6) does provide guidance regarding how such resources will be addressed during RMP implementation (e.g., conducting proper cultural resource studies existing to any development, and protection of resources found during such studies). No reference is made in the existing RMP to interpretation and education opportunities associated with these resources. The RMP Update will include Goal/Objective statements reflecting Reclamation's responsibilities and approach to cultural resources, including prehistoric and historic sites and Indian Trust Assets. Opportunities for interpretation and education will also be explored, including the opportunity represented by the Ambush Rock site. In the latter regard, see A.4.1—Develop Interpretive Environmental Education Areas.

Issue Category: A.3.1 – Presence of Archaeological Sites

Planning Team Notes: A Class III cultural resources survey has been completed for the Reclamation lands at Lake Cascade. Traditional Cultural Properties (TCPs) and Indian Trust Assets (ITAs) are also being studied. The results of these studies will be used in the alternatives analysis and environmental assessment for the RMP Update.

Issue Category: A.3.2 – Addressing Cultural Resource Responsibilities, Enforcement, and Education—Proper Attention to Cultural Resources in All Management Actions

Discussions: The involved Indian Tribes have stressed that the RMP Update is an opportunity to clarify and further define cultural resource responsibilities and enforcement, including education of management agencies.

Planning Team Note: Reclamation is required by law to ensure proper attention to cultural resources (including archaeological and historic resources, TCPs, and ITAs) in all actions on its lands. The RMP Update will incorporate full compliance with these requirements, including protection and potential for interpretation of these resources.

Issue Category: A.3.3 – Develop/Improve Ambush Rock Site as a Public Interest Site

Discussions: The significance of the Ambush Rock site (also referred to as Massacre Rock) has been cited several times in discussion thus far. This site is located on Reclamation land near the dam. Substantial interest exists for developing interpretive facilities at this site, including an appropriate plaque, and information kiosk. An accessible trail would also be necessary if facilities are developed. An interpretive sign exists along Highway 55. The County Engineer's office has previously requested

grant money to provide for interpretive facilities. For further discussion of RMP approach to historic site interpretation, see A.4.1-- Develop Interpretive Environmental Education Areas.

Issue Category: A.3.4 – Incorporate historical perspective in the Environmental Assessment.

Planning Team Note: The cultural resource studies noted above, as well as Reclamation’s responsibility for management and protection of cultural resources, include historic as well as prehistoric resources. The RMP process will explore alternatives for protection, interpretation, or mitigation of potential impacts to all such resources under Reclamation’s jurisdiction.

Problem Statements: A.4 – General

Issue Category: A.4.1 – Develop Interpretive Environmental Education Areas

Discussions: Provide additional environmental and cultural/historic interpretation and education opportunities, either directly through Reclamation RMP programs or through support to other agencies. Ensure that access to such interpretive areas is appropriate to the resource present (i.e., does not damage or disturb the resource). Seek to provide varying types of access so that all members of the public are included (e.g. vehicular access at appropriate sites, non-motorized trails, access for the disabled, etc.). Also provide users with appropriate information to maximize education and enjoyment, including: kiosks, interpretive signs/viewing stations, brochures/information cards, self-guided trail materials, etc.

In support of this desire, a subcommittee of AHWG members will assemble a list of potential interpretive sites within the RMP area. This list will include both natural and cultural/historic resource sites. Once completed, this list along with input from the RMP Team will be used in developing RMP alternatives and related programs. Pending completion of this list, resources identified through AHWG discussion include:

Natural Resources:

- North Fork Arm
- Tamarack Falls Bridge area
- At the end of the Boulder Creek C/OS area (perhaps a boardwalk viewing area);
- South of Poison Creek/Medicare Point (perhaps a boardwalk, hiking trail, and/or vehicle turn-out);
- Mallard Bay; and
- South end of reservoir.

Cultural/Historic Resources:

- Ambush Rock, including historic grave site;
- Old town site(s) of Van Wyck, Cabarton and Arling;
- Old railroad grade (eligible for National Historic Register); and
- Old bridge by the dam; (eligible for National Historic Register).
- Dam

Planning Team Notes: Objective 2.2.7 in the Recreation section of the existing RMP addresses the desirability of providing opportunities for nature interpretation and wildlife observation; however, no reference is made to cultural/historic interpretation and education. The RMP Update can revise this objective to include both environmental and cultural/historic opportunities; and, as noted elsewhere, can include additional detail regarding where and how these opportunities will be provided. All plans for interpretive facilities will be made through consultation with knowledgeable biologists and cultural resource specialists, as appropriate.

Issue Category: A.4.2 – Inclusion of Tribes' Snake River Policy in RMP (supporting a natural river ecosystem)

Discussions: The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes have prepared and adopted a policy statement addressing conservation, protection, and enhancement of natural and cultural resources in the Snake River Basin. Excerpts from this policy document are provided below:

“ the [Snake River] Basin is being viewed, as never before, as a valuable resource contributing to the overall Pacific Northwest regional conservation framework. The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes support efforts to conserve, protect, and enhance natural and cultural resources within the Basin and therefore establish this policy

Since time immemorial, the Snake River Basin has provided substantial resources that sustain the diverse uses of the native Indian Tribes, including the Shoshone Bannock. The significance of these uses is partially reflected in the contemporary values associated with the many culturally sensitive species and geographic areas within the Basin. Various land management practices, such as construction and operation of hydroelectric projects have contributed extensively to the loss of these crucial resources and reduced the productive capabilities of many resource systems. These losses have never been comprehensively identified or addressed as is the desire of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes.

The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes reserved guaranteed continuous use Rights to utilize resources with the region that encompasses and includes lands of the Snake River Basin. The Fort Hall Business Council has recognized the contemporary importance of these Rights and resources by advocating certain resource protection and restoration programs and by preserving a harvest opportunity on culturally significant resources necessary to fulfill inherent, contemporary, and traditional Treaty Rights. However, certain resource utilization activities, including the operation of Federal and non-Federal hydroelectric projects effect these resources and consequently, Tribal reserved Rights.

It has always been the intent and action of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes to promote the conservation, protection, restoration, and enhancement of natural resources during the processes that consider the operation and management of Federal projects and during the land management activities of other entities. This Policy re-emphasizes the Tribes' previous policies with regards to these processes and activities

Policy Statement: *The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes (Tribes) will pursue, promote, and where necessary, initiate efforts to restore the Snake River system and affected unoccupied lands to a natural condition. This includes the restoration of component resources to conditions which most closely represent the ecological feature associated with a natural riverine ecosystem. In addition, the Tribes will work to ensure the protection, preservation, and where appropriate, the enhancement of Rights reserved by the Tribes under the Fort Bridge Treaty of 1868 and any inherent aboriginal right.*

All cooperating agencies will be expected to utilize all available means, consistent with their respective trust responsibility mandates, to protect Treaty rights and Tribal interests consistent with this policy.”

The Tribes would like to see their policy statement included in the RMP as their issue statement on water resources management; and to have this policy considered throughout the RMP Update process.

Planning Team Note: The above excerpts from the Shoshone-Bannock policy document clearly portray the Tribes’ viewpoint and intent regarding the preparation, content, and direction of the RMP Update. Every effort will be made to reflect the intent of the Tribes’ Policy in revisions to the goals and objectives in the RMP Update. However, further discussion may be needed to confirm the most appropriate means by which this policy intent can be incorporated into the RMP.

B. RECREATION

Problem Statements: B.1 – General

Issue Category: B.1.1 – Increasing Demand for Public Recreation at Lake Cascade

Discussions: This public comment was reiterated in AHWG discussion, with the additional perspective that recreation demand must be met within the capacity of the resources at Cascade. Further accommodation of recreation demand should not be made in a manner which degrades the qualities which bring people to the area in the first place.

Planning Team Notes: Goals 2.1 and 2.2 of the existing RMP address meeting demand for recreational opportunities at the reservoir, including perspectives regarding resource limitations and carrying capacity.

Issue Category: B.1.2 – Improve/Enhance Recreation Opportunities in Environmentally Responsible Manner to Promote Economic Growth and Stability

Discussions and Planning Team Notes: Same as B.1.1, above.

Issue Category: B.1.3 – Improve /Increase Recreation Opportunities for All Users and Provide Additional Facilities (i.e., Campgrounds, Toilets, Trash Receptacles, Fish Cleaning Sites)

Discussions and Planning Team Notes: Same as B.1.1, above.

Issue Category: B.1.4 – Create Zones for Different Recreation Activities

Discussions and Planning Team Notes: Same as B.1.1, above. In addition, Objectives 2.3.4, 2.3.5, and 3.1.4 of the existing RMP address, respectively, potential needs to establish water surface use zones to minimize conflicts, prohibition (as a last resort) of certain uses in specific areas to reduce conflict or enhance safety, and planning for compatible use areas along the shoreline to accommodate the full spectrum of user groups and activities. Additional detail regarding user conflicts and consequent desires to establish use-specific zones both on the water surface and along the shoreline is provided below under Issue Category B.1.6—User Conflicts.

Issue Category: B.1.5 – Improve/Increase Non-Motorized Recreational Opportunities

Discussions: AHWG discussion of this concern identified the following specific areas of attention for the RMP update: [1] creation of walking and bicycling paths (this use would also include nature and cultural resource interpretation trails), [2] provision of walk-in tent camping opportunities (e.g., Driftwood Point, Osprey point), [3] provision of boat-free areas of the reservoir dedicated to swimming, and [4] designation of non-motorized areas of the reservoir to accommodate canoeing, paddle-boating, and other forms of non-motorized recreation.

In these regards, it is noted that under current conditions, people walking or biking must use the road system; and since there are no shoulders along the roads in the area, this can be very dangerous (especially on the west side); the RMP should look at ways to assist in mitigating this situation through trail development. It has also been suggested that a path or greenbelt be developed around the reservoir. (see B.3.7—Trails/Paths for further discussion of opportunities in this regard). Also, the Boulder Creek day use area is cited as an example of significant conflicts between swimming/non-motorized activities and power boat uses. This area has experienced the most calls by IDPR to the marine deputies due to violations of the existing (State-mandated) 100-foot no-wake zone in swimming areas. Clearly, enforcement of existing regulations is part of the issue; however, provision of more formal, designated swimming areas (such as that provided at Van Wyck Park) could also help using buoys and floating docks.

Planning Team Notes: Goals 2.1 and 2.2 of the existing RMP address meeting demand for recreational opportunities at the reservoir, including perspectives regarding resource limitations and carrying capacity. In addition, (1) Objectives 2.2.3-2.2.5 of the existing RMP addressing tent camping and trail system development, and (2) Objective 2.3.4 addresses reduction of recreation conflicts (i.e., encompassing the idea of accommodating non-motorized and motorized uses). In the latter regard, issues surrounding user conflicts and safety are discussed in several specific categories herein, see B.1.6--Avoid Use Conflicts for further detail and citations of other relevant issue categories).

Issue Category: B.1.6 – Avoid Use Conflicts

*Specific Issues – Conflicting Recreation Activities (e.g., motorized vs. non-motorized different types of motorized)
Land and Water Use Compatibility Concerns*

Discussions: The following areas of concern have been identified by the public and the AHWG for attention in the RMP Update:

- **Boating conflicts:**
 - Motorized vs. non-motorized boating (i.e., impacts from power boats and personal watercraft on users who wish to swim, canoe, paddle-boat, fish, etc. in designated recreation use areas);
 - Personal watercraft vs. all other boaters (i.e., noise, annoyance/harassment, safety concerns);
 - Boating vs. Swimming (especially safety hazards), with conflicts occurring primarily where there are good beaches (e.g., Boulder Creek and Cabarton).
- **Land-based activity conflicts:**
 - Safety concerns related to hiking and bicycling on public roads (due to the absence of separate trails or adequate road shoulders)
 - Group camping needs vs. individual campsite needs (i.e., due to lack of group camping facilities, large groups must essentially “move in” to large areas of existing campgrounds, displacing or disrupting the activities of single families);
 - RV camping needs vs. tent camping (i.e., due to limited availability of tent campsites, tent campers must use developed RV spaces, displacing RV campers in peak periods).

- Land-water use conflicts:

- Noise and erosion caused by power boat and personal watercraft activities near the shoreline in residential areas.

AHWG members indicate that the highest “density” of boating related conflicts occur along the northeast shore, from Tamarack Falls Bridge to Arrowhead Point, with a primary area of concern being Boulder Creek. It was noted that this is the same area WestRock is proposed, as well as where approximately 80% of the boats dock. Regarding land based activity conflicts, these occur more generally all around the reservoir, with concerns for hiking and biking activities cited more often along the west side road and on the east side from Crown Point south. It was suggested that the North Fork Arm be set aside for jet skis. It was noted that this has been mentioned before; however, it has not been carried forward because that area has the highest percentage of wildlife and is the most pristine on the reservoir. Also, safety hazards exist due to a large number of stumps during low water.

Planning Team Notes: Goal 2.3 and associated objectives of the existing RMP address the issue of use conflicts. The RMP Update can include additional detail regarding where such conflicts are now a problem and what solutions are preferred to address such problems. Refer to the following Issue Categories for additional perspective these issues:

- B.2.5--Impacts of Personal Watercraft
- B.2.6--Boating/Water Recreation Safety Regulation
- B.2.7--Boulder Creek
- B.3.2--Meet the Need for Additional Sites and Facilities
- B.3.6--ORV Use
- B.3.7--Trails/Paths
- C.1.9--Noise Control

Problem Statements: B.2 – Boating and Other Water Uses

Issue Category: B.2.1 – Cascade Marina Development/Other Marinas

Discussions: There is clearly widespread support for developing a marina at Lake Cascade; a preliminary siting study have shown that the Van Wyck Park area is probably the most likely location for this marina. Such a marina could provide: moorage, safe water, fuel sales on the water. Potential problems and challenges include:

- Funding sources — marina will need to be funded through multiple sources (public and private);
- Environmental constraints — Corps of Engineers permit for a breakwater, water quality impacts;
- May result in increased demand for water access and boating capacity; and
- May highlight the critical need for (boating) regulations.

Regarding the potential need for other marinas around the reservoir, the AHWG noted that boating services are needed now on the northwest side, including fuel and additional moorage. Further, if the WestRock development occurs (see C.5.3), this need will increase significantly.

Planning Team Notes: Objective 2.1.8 of the existing RMP anticipates the Cascade marina, at the location identified as most likely in a recent siting study. In the RMP Update, additional detail should be added regarding the implementation program for this marina; revisions to the wording of the objective may also be warranted based on current conditions. Also, Objective 2.4.2 of the existing RMP suggests exploring public/private partnerships and concession agreements to assist in accomplishing the marina. In this regard, it is relevant to note that any new recreation development or improvements, including the marina, will require a 50-50 Federal and non-Federal cost share arrangement.

Objective 2.1.9 in the existing RMP allows for additional marinas around the reservoir “as demand warrants.” To the extent that the RMP Update process confirms the need for a northwest marina (or such facilities at other locations), the existing RMP Goals and Objective accommodate this need. Objective 2.1.9 should be revisited as part of the Update RMP/EA alternatives analysis process.

Issue Category: B.2.2 – Boat Docks/Moorage

Specific Issues –

- Need for more public moorage, especially on the northwest shore*
- Increased availability of private dock permits*
- Reduce fees for boat dock permits*
- Simplify boat dock permit process*

Discussions: There is a definite lack of moorage available to the public, including back lot owners. More attention is needed to providing moorage, especially protected moorage, at all campgrounds and recreation sites. This is particularly true along the northwest shore, where people using the camping facilities have no place to moor their boats; instead, they just pull the boats up to the shore or into a tributary stream, causing erosion and impact to shoreline vegetation. Suggestions in this regard include

mooring buoys and/or concession run or self pay public dock facilities. County Waterways grants could be a potential source of funding for these. However, the challenge of protecting dock complexes in the face of the storms which are common on the reservoir is also noted; this is especially the case along the eastern shore. One member of the AHWG suggests that breakwaters be provided at all major moorage installations. There is a need to increase funding for development and maintenance of moorage.

There is also a need for public moorage in areas of high boating activity in the RR areas; suggestions include provision of community docks and floating docks moored out in the reservoir for temporary use, so boaters would not need to access private docks or the shoreline in these areas.

Regarding private docks (which are currently permitted only in RR areas unless grandfathered in, in C/OS areas), AHWG discussion focused on requests for:

- Increased availability of permits in RR areas, particularly for residents inland from the shore (currently, permits are only issued to owners of littoral lots). The potential for community docks was noted and the idea of floating docks may also apply;
- Relaxation of the prohibition of private dock permits in all areas except RR (or redesignation of some current C/OS areas to RR): It was suggested that the current RMP is too restrictive in permitting private docks only in RR areas. The request was made that Reclamation consider docks on a case-by-case basis in C/OS areas if such docks would not significantly conflict with the intent of the C/OS designation. Alternatively, some landowners inland of C/OS areas have requested that the RMP Update process consider either [1] specific redesignations of C/OS areas to RR, or [2] a new land use designation which bridges the current RR and C/OS designations. Such a new designation (the term Rural Open Space is suggested) would maintain the open space character of the area, but permit carefully sited docks and necessary land access routes to them. AHWG members who represent these concerns provided specific locations on project area maps where options for additional docks should be considered.
- It has been pointed out that the process of obtaining a dock permit be simplified.
- Redo the appraisal of existing docks and the evaluation of the dock fee structure to confirm fairness: Dock owners point out that the fees may be too high given that the docks are only usable for a short season each year. It is also suggested that the fees be based on covering Reclamation's administrative cost for the permit system, rather than on the fair market value of the docks. In response to these suggestions, Reclamation noted that a new appraisal of the docks is currently under way. In response to regarding the season of use consideration, the season varies significantly from location to location around the reservoir and it will not be possible to conduct the appraisal on a dock-by-dock basis; therefore, certain assumptions will need to be made. Also, Federal regulations require that fair market value be charged for such rights of use on public lands.

Planning Team Notes Original Discussion:

The issue of boat docks/moorage is addressed in several places in the existing RMP's goals and objectives. Specifically:

- Objective 2.1.1 seeks to provide public use docks/moorage at all recreation sites.
- The issue of private boat docks is addressed in Objectives 2.1.3, 3.2.2, and 4.4.2 of the existing RMP. These objectives provide for, respectively: (1) the “grand fathering” of private docks already permitted in residential areas (RR and C/OS) at the time of RMP adoption; (2) development a “long term, comprehensive policy” regarding individual boat docks; and (3) boat dock permittees paying their fair share of service and management costs (i.e., through permit fees). The comprehensive policy anticipated in item 2 above is described in the RMP, stating that property owners adjoining RR areas will be allowed one dock per littoral lot (under a recreational permit system—see C.5.2 [Encroachments on Reclamation Lands by Private Owners], below).
- Objective 2.1.2 encourages the use of community docks, shared by multiple shoreline owners, instead of a proliferation of individual docks.
- Additional private docks are specifically prohibited in Conservation Open Space (C/OS) areas, Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs), and designated recreation areas.

Regarding the issue of public moorage, the existing RMP addresses the provision of such moorage at recreation sites; however, insufficient action (at least from a public perception standpoint) has been taken to accomplish this objective. The RMP Update should establish clear implementation priorities and actions in this regard. Regarding the AHWG suggestion that breakwaters be provided at all major moorage locations, it is unlikely that such facilities would be feasible due to their high cost (as evidenced by the cost estimates developed for Cascade Marina breakwater).

Related to private docks, the existing RMP does not accommodate dock permits for landowners inland of the reservoir shore. The concept of community docks or concession run moorage locations could be investigated in the RMP Update process. The RMP Update can also consider AHWG suggestions for land use designation changes which expand the area currently designated as RR or otherwise respond to requests for relaxation of the current plan's prohibition of private docks except in RR areas. However, it must be noted that the restrictions on private docks contained in the existing plan were developed as a means of limiting proliferation of private docks, especially in congested areas of the reservoir. Relaxation of these restrictions could contribute to further boating congestion and conflicts in some areas, as well as extend the impact of dock construction, use and land access to areas now protected.

Another alternative related to private boat docks is a return to Reclamation's original (i.e., pre-1991 RMP) approach, which was to phase out private boat docks entirely and replace them with some form of public/community-oriented moorage, perhaps run by concessionaires. Reclamation will be looking at this option as part of the RMP Update process.

Planning Team Notes Additional Information:

Reclamation has completed (Draft Final) “Policy, Directives and Standards” for lands and use of the Federal lands which Reclamation administers. These directives state that no new permits for private or semiprivate uses will be issued. Where we have a planning process, such as an RMP, we can continue uses (renewals) if no public need is identified, otherwise the permits would be terminated or phased out. It is our understanding that Cascade is the only Reclamation reservoir where private boat docks exist and that all others have been terminated and/or phased out. The alternatives, therefore, will need to reflect what options are possible within the current policy. It reads as follows:

“D. Private/Semiprivate Uses.

(1) Exclusive Uses to be Discontinued. New use authorizations for exclusive private or semiprivate uses of Reclamation lands for permanent purposes such as cabins, homes, mobile homes, condominiums, townhouses, clubs, organized camps, long-term material storage, miscellaneous buildings, commercial businesses not associated with public or authorized project uses, boat docks, recreation facilities, landscaping, patios, decks, porches, and other private facilities will not be issued. Where use authorizations for such purposes already exist, Area Managers will develop definitive guidelines as part of the planning process to determine when these sites are needed for public use. Once the guidelines are developed for an area, an analysis of the site permits will be completed to determine if continued private or semiprivate use is justified. If not, action will be taken to terminate or phase out such use in accordance with 43 CFR 21 and other Reclamation policy and procedures.”

Issue Category: B.2.3 – Enhance Fishing Opportunities

Discussions: The concept of providing fishing oriented access sites around the reservoir and improving winter access for fishing, as well as the relationships between water quality, reservoir levels, and fish habitat to fishing opportunities, are discussed above in A.1.2—Fishery. Related to this issue, it is also noted that fishing depends on water quality, which places increased emphasis on accomplishment of water quality improvement. It was suggested that fishing piers be provided off the shoreline to protect the shoreline and enhance fishing opportunities. Areas to improve access to the shoreline for fishing include Medicare Point, walk-throughs on the fence on the west on the west side of the reservoir, and Sugarloaf Peninsula in the Gold Fork Arm.

Planning Team Notes: Specific provision of fishing access points, piers, or floating docks was not addressed in the existing RMP, beyond such accommodations which were inherent in identified developed recreation sites. The RMP Update effort should include an objective in this regard, with associated detail addressing priority locations and facilities.

Issue Category: B.2.4 – Environmental Impacts of Increased Boating on Lake Cascade

Discussions: Impacts include: Erosion, safety hazards, noise, and water quality degradation.

Planning Team Notes: The concerns identified under this issue are varied and relate both to the total volume of boat/watercraft using the reservoir (i.e., general environmental/carrying capacity impacts), and to the effects of concentrated use in specific areas (e.g., Boulder Creek). These concerns are addressed at several points in the existing RMP, with the intent of either (1) avoiding boating uses from exceeding the carrying capacity of the reservoir, or (2) providing regulation of boating uses in areas where specific concerns exist related to noise, erosion, safety, etc. Refer to Goals 2.1, 2.3, and 4.1 of the existing RMP for coverage of these concerns. A review of these goals, and their associated objectives, suggests that adequate general language addressing these concerns is present in the existing RMP; however, either (1) additional detail needs to be added related to specific activities, locations, or regulations which are high priorities, or (2) renewed effort is needed to accomplish the objectives of the existing RMP (e.g. getting regulations and/or enforcement in place regarding noise, boating restrictions, safety regulations, etc.).

Overall, it is suggested that existing RMP language is a good start in addressing these concerns; the RMP Update should provide appropriate revisions, additional detail, and priority action programs.

Issue Category: B.2.5 – Impacts of Personal Watercraft (noise, safety)

Discussions: The primary issues surrounding personal water craft use are: safety concerns (i.e., conflicts with other motorized uses and with non-motorized boating, swimming, etc.), noise, and general annoyance/harassment of other boaters. In addressing these issues, AHWG members stress that [1] regulations regarding boating safety must be better enforced (i.e., the existing 100 foot no-wake zone between motorized uses and swimmers or other boats), [2] new water use zone regulations may be necessary (i.e., areas where personal watercraft are prohibited), and [3] the RMP should seek to identify areas where personal watercraft are specifically allowed (e.g., personal watercraft recreation areas). In the last regard, it has been suggested that the North Fork Arm of the reservoir, above Tamarack Falls bridge, be designated as a personal watercraft recreation area. However, this area is currently a Wildlife Management Area containing significant biological resources, perhaps the highest concentration of such resources in the RMP area; as such, both [1] existing policy and regulations regarding protection of wetlands, endangered species and natural resources in general, and [2] public desires to protect WMAs would argue against this concept.

Planning Team Notes: See Issue Categories – B.1.6 (Avoid Use Conflicts), and B.2.4 (Environmental Impacts of Increased Boating on Lake Cascade), and B.2.6 (Boating/Water Recreation Safety Regulation).

Issue Category: B.2.6 – Boating/Water Recreation Safety Regulation (personal watercraft, powerboats, waterskiing)

Discussions: The reasons why regulation of boating/water recreation activities is or may be needed (as identified by the public and the AHWG) have been discussed in several of the above issue categories; and the primary locations where such regulation is most needed have been identified. The RMP will need to explore and illuminate the most pressing needs for such regulation around the reservoir.

Planning Team Notes: Regulation of water surface uses and enforcement of these regulations are within

the jurisdiction of Valley County. Reclamation can will work with the County to provide guidance and recommendations to the County regarding the need for and locations of such regulation(s) and/or enforcement.

In addressing the need for water surface use regulations at Lake Cascade, the following points are relevant:

- The only existing regulation which applies in trying to address existing or potential water safety and other conflicts is the State law which establishes as 100 foot no-wake zone along the shoreline, and between power boaters and swimmers or other boaters. Increased public education and enforcement of this regulation could mitigate many of the conflicts which now occur.
- The existing RMP designated several no-wake and non-motorized zones around the reservoir, associated primarily with WMAs; however, these zones have not been adopted by the County.
- The RMP Update process is an excellent forum for identifying areas where increased regulation or enforcement may be needed (e.g., Boulder Creek, as discussed elsewhere herein). This process must also confirm the desirability of the no-wake or non-motorized zones proposed in the existing RMP. However, action to implement these regulations must be carried forward by Valley County; and enforcement must be provide by the County. The RMP Update must, therefore, include a specific program wherein Reclamation will work with the County to get needed regulations adopted and/or provide the necessary funding or manpower to achieve needed enforcement.

Issue Category: B.2.7 – Boulder Creek Arm

*Specific Issues – Properly manage activities
Open for all motorized activities*

Discussions: Significant conflicts occur in the Boulder Creek arm of the reservoir, stemming from the high density of boating uses and the wide variety of water users. These include:

- High noise levels from power craft use (i.e., water skiing, personal water craft) conflicting with residential character of the shore zone;
- High levels of unregulated power boat usage causing both safety and “quality of experience” concerns for swimmers and non-motorized boaters;
- Frequent violations of the State mandated 100-foot no-wake zone between power boaters and swimmers, other boaters and/or the shoreline.

The RMP Update should address and resolve these conflicts, including specific regulations or restrictions required, and the entities responsibility for adopting and enforcing them. One alternative proposed by residents of the area is to make the Boulder Creek arm a no-wake boating zone. Other residents of the area indicate that the situation should be resolved without restriction on the types of boating activity; instead, better enforcement of existing safety regulations should be pursued.

Planning Team Notes: See Issue Categories – B.1.6 (Avoid Use Conflicts), and B.2.6 (Boating/Water Recreation Safety Regulation).

Issue Category: B.2.8 – Stump Removal

Discussions: Better public information should be provided regarding the general areas and types of hazard caused by subsurface tree stumps (e.g., providing brochures and pictures, and posting warnings at launch ramps). It was also noted in AHWG discussion that any major program of stump removal would likely conflict with the desire to maintain and enhance fish habitat.

Planning Team Notes: Removal of stumps and other boating hazards was suggested during the original RMP process. However, this action was not included in the RMP. The existing RMP does include an objective (2.3.8) which calls for conducting a survey of these hazards, the results of which would be available to the public as an aid to boating safety. Such a survey is not now considered feasible or justified; the general areas where stumps represent a hazard are known and information on this hazard can be provided to the boating public.

Problem Statements: B.3 – Land-Based Activities

Issue Category: B.3.1 – Implement Proposals for Hike/Walk/Golf Course in Existing RMP

Discussions and Planning Team Notes: See B.3.7—Trail/Paths. Also, Objective 2.2.9 of the existing RMP encourages expansion of golfing opportunities at appropriate locations, in conjunction with local jurisdictions and/or landowners.

Issue Category: B.3.2 – Meet the Need for Additional Sites and Facilities

Discussions: Discussion centered on the need for camping sites and facilities. It was noted that campgrounds are nearly always full and that demand is high. Perspectives on the kinds of conflicts or site shortages which can result from this high demand have been noted in prior discussions (e.g., tent campers using RV sites, groups essentially “taking over” portions of existing campgrounds and displacing single family campers, etc.). Also, at least some of the unauthorized/ad hoc camping which occurs (causing environmental damage) is due to a shortage of developed sites. Specific points regarding needs and locations include:

- Camping capacity needs to be expanded overall—all types—by providing expansion of existing sites and/or developing new sites.
- Provide additional RV sites and reconfigure existing sites to accommodate the newer, larger RVs and those families who bring more than one vehicle (e.g., RV and boat trailer, or RV and SUV);
- Provide for group camping (demand for these facilities is high)—At least one site (minimum 10 units; maximum 30 units) dedicated to group camping is needed on each side of the reservoir, with each capable of accommodating multiple groups. Potential locations may include between Crown Point and Cabarton and south of Poison Creek (although, in the latter regard, the development of

WestRock will probably displace all or most camping in this general area, in favor of day use activities, and thus would make the Poison Creek location infeasible);

- Provide for tent camping, in areas separate from RV sites;
- Separate campground sites from day use areas;
- Provide for at least some recreation areas (e.g., parking, restrooms) to be open during the winter.
- The Van Wyck and Big Sage sites should be developed for camping; they are currently receiving a lot of informal, uncontrolled use and environmental damage is occurring;
- The Blue Heron site was designated in the existing RMP for conversion from RV and group camping to predominantly day use, with some tent camping. This site should probably remain as a fully developed campground. It is used often by the sailing association;
- Erosion is causing loss of the day use area at the Cabarton recreation site;
- Osprey Point is an option for some form of camping, but due to its distance from the water it is not the answer for group camping or for visitors who come to Cascade to be near the water; and
- Improve campground facilities, including provision of showers, additional water sources, and RV hook-ups.

Planning Team Notes: Objectives 2.2.1-3 of the existing RMP address meeting demand for RV and tent camping capacity. Group camping and picnic sites, to the extent addressed, as well as specific facilities (such as showers, water, etc.) to be provided at each recreation site are addressed in the more detailed description of the RMP (see Table 31). The above notes from public comments should serve as starting point for reviewing the recreation site and facility developments proposed in the existing RMP; and for developing alternatives for the RMP Update EA. Also, provision for group camping and specification of the desired range of amenities to be provided at various types of recreation sites can be reflected in the Objectives section of the RMP Update (just as RV and tent camping are reflected now).

Issue Category: B.3.3 – Improve Parking Availability at Recreation Sites

Discussions: Overall, adequate parking needs to be provided at all sites to accommodate the sites' user capacity; this includes day use sites, campgrounds, fishing areas, etc. As noted above, parking needs to be reconfigured and/or expanded at existing sites to accommodate both more and larger RVs and for parking of other vehicles brought by visitors (e.g., boat trailers, ATV's, other automobiles). In some areas, such as Big Sage, parking needs to be formalized.

Parking for winter activities needs special attention, particularly snowmobile related parking on the west side. An important issue associated with parking in winter is the need for and cost of plowing to keep the parking areas accessible. Currently, snowmobilers often park in people's driveways or constrict the roadway because they have nowhere else to park their vehicles and trailers. Local snowmobile organizations have worked with the County to widen the plowed area along roads in order to provide parking along the roads. This has been more cost effective than trying to provide dedicated, off street parking areas. Other winter activities which require parking include cross-country skiing and ice fishing. For all winter activities, plowing is needed to provide access and keep parking areas open.

The AHWG also discussed the concept of users paying for winter parking and noted that many users would probably be willing to do this, because they recognize the cost of keeping the areas plowed. The point was made that there normally is not charge for parking on Federal land. Nevertheless, the concept of paying for parking may be useful in determining how to meet the need, such as a winter parking pass.

Planning Team Notes: Objective 3.4.2 of the existing RMP addresses provision of adequate parking at all designated use areas, including recreation sites; Objective 2.1.6 specifically addresses parking and restroom facilities at boat ramp locations. The RMP Update process should add detail supporting these objectives in terms of specific locations, actions and priorities. In planning for these accommodations, however, care must be taken not to induce levels of activity which exceed the carrying capacity of land and water resources or lead to increased conflicts between recreationists.

Issue Category: B.3.4 – Restrict Unauthorized Camping

Discussions: Installation of more signage (e.g., “No Overnight Camping” or “Day Use Only”) and better enforcement should help solve this problem. The Tamarack Falls Bridge area, Van Wyck Park (north of the developed area), and Big Sage are cited as areas where specific attention is needed to restricting unauthorized camping. The adverse effects of unauthorized camping include environmental degradation and essentially shutting day use visitors out of certain areas by making them appear to be campsites.

Planning Team Notes: This issue is not directly addressed in the Goals and Objectives of the existing RMP; instead, recreation policies contained in Section 5.3.4 of the RMP prohibit camping outside of designated campgrounds and associated overflow areas. To the extent that unauthorized camping and other uses are occurring (and are impacting resources or conflicting with adjacent private lands) the solution rests in enforcement. Certainly, the specific lands designated for camping can be revisited as part of the RMP Update process; however, enforcement of land use restrictions will be a key factor in managing unauthorized activities in the future.

Issue Category: B.3.5 – Promote Undeveloped Recreation Activities

Discussions: Walk, bike, and boat-in campsites and interpretive, non-motorized trails are noted as the types of activities which are most needed.

Planning Team Notes: Objective 2.2.3 of the existing RMP calls for expansion of tent camping opportunities apart from developed, RV-oriented sites (including drive-in, hike-in and/or boat-in). The RMP Update must add detail regarding specific locations and specific activities in order to better accomplish this objective.

Issue Category: B.3.6 – Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) Use

*Specific Issues – Limit Negative Impacts of ORVs (e.g., noise, erosion)
 Designate areas and/or trails for ATV/ORV use*

Discussions: The public land base surrounding Lake Cascade is generally not large enough to accommodate unrestricted ORV use, especially considering the environmental impact which accompanies such unrestricted vehicular activity. However, some members of the AHWG suggest that the original RMP is too restrictive in its prohibition of all ORV/ATV access. It is suggested that the RMP update should explore the need and potential for some limited ATV/ORV use trails or areas for example: [1] in the residential areas of the reservoir young people have no place to ride motorcycles and ATVs and are thus forced out onto the streets (a safety concern), and [2] some accommodation is needed for elderly or disabled residents and visitors to reach the shore from residential areas (specifically the area from Vista Point to Crown Point) and to access wildlife viewing or fishing areas. Perhaps some access trails could be identified and provided to help mitigate this concern. Public suggestions for such access include the following, but further discussion is needed:

- Boulder Creek Conservation/Open Space (C/OS) area — this area has not been open to ATV/ORVs, however, prior to the existing RMP was once used for such and is the example cited of an area where users are forced onto public streets due to the area's closure to all motorized use. In this area, however, careful management of access is critical to protect the northern part of Boulder Creek due to increased subdivision development in the area and a reduction of open space;
- ATV access for the disabled from the Crown Point and Vista Point residential areas to the reservoir shore; and
- Other selected corridors (including consideration of disabled access) through other C/OS areas and through the WMAs to provide shoreline recreation access.

In any case, management and enforcement will be needed to avoid adverse impacts from such uses. Currently, unmanaged and unrestricted use of ATVs and other ORVs is a problem in the drawdown areas of the reservoir, especially near the boat ramps. This is primarily due to safety and pollution concerns.

Planning Team Notes: Objective 2.2.8 of the existing RMP calls for potential provision of ORV staging areas for access to USFS lands on the west side of the reservoir; otherwise, this objective states that all other Reclamation land around the reservoir is closed to "unrestricted" ORV use. Also, Objective 1.1.3 and the definition of acceptable uses in WMAs and C/OS areas addressed the desirability of restricting vehicular access, including ORVs, in these areas.

Currently, published Reclamation policy is that all Reclamation lands are closed to ORV use unless specifically designated as open to such use. During preparation of the existing RMP, provision for ORV use was considered, but was not adopted due to limitations of the land resource and the impacts of historic unmanaged vehicular access.

The alternatives analysis for the RMP Update can revisit this issue, if desired. Alternatives could include designated trails to specific areas, as noted in AHWG discussion. It is still likely, however, that provision of unrestricted or intensive ORV use areas will not be acceptable from an environmental impact standpoint. In addition, monitoring and enforcement will become significant issues if ORV/ATV

trails are proposed for use only by the elderly or disabled and not by the general public; it is probable that any such trails considered will need to be viewed as open to all and their acceptability and environmental impact would be assessed based on this assumption.

Issue Category: B.3.7 – Trails/Paths

*Specific Issues – Creation of recreation trails in the valley
Development of greenbelt path along east side
See also: Other Land Uses & Land Management: Crown Point*

Discussions: Demand for trail opportunities and facilities is high. Currently there are no formally designated and signed trails in the main public use areas (the Boulder Creek area does have a trail with “no motorized vehicles” signage; however, this is not a major public use area). The RMP Update should pursue the following opportunities for trail development:

- Crown Point railroad grade;
- Crown Point through Van Wyck Park and down the southeast shore;
- Sugarloaf peninsula, including bird viewing trails;
- Connecting camping and recreation sites along west shore; and
- Loop trail/greenway around the reservoir
- Potential for all-season use (e.g., for cross-country skiing).

Especially in the northwest and southeast areas, conflicts and safety concerns centered on walkers and bicyclists needing to use the road system are a major concern; trail development could help in mitigating this concern.

AHWG members also noted that trail development could be implemented in part through the assistance from the National Guard. A comment was made that we have to be careful in adding paved trails, etc. as it may change the area to urban/suburban in the DEQ water quality plan.

Planning Team Notes: Objectives 2.2.4 and 2.2.5 of the existing RMP call for exploration and development of trail systems at various areas around the reservoir. Also, concept diagrams in the RMP portray some candidate locations for trails. The RMP Update should reconsider the range of proposed trail types, locations and priorities, considering both the content of the existing RMP and public input provided for the updated RMP.

Issue Category: B.3.8 – Cascade Airstrip

*Specific Issues – Reactivate Cascade Airstrip
Do Not Open Cascade Airstrip*

Discussions: As evidenced by the issue statements themselves, the RMP Update should look at both options: opening the airstrip and keeping closed.

Planning Team Notes: The existing RMP called for permitting the State Aeronautics Department to re-open the airstrip (Objective 2.2.10). Currently, as noted in public comments, opinions vary regarding whether or not Reclamation should proceed with this objective. Further, Reclamation's investigation of the terms by which the proposed land exchange can be accomplished suggest that proceeding forward with this exchange may not be desirable from public land value and land use points of view. Thus, both options, proceeding and not proceeding with reactivation, will be considered as part of the alternatives analysis process; this process will include review of the impacts on surrounding land uses which would occur with re-opening the airstrip. In either case, the RMP process should review all reasonable potential uses for the land involved (including boat-in camping or day use, as well as other potential uses).

Issue Category: **B.3.9 – Winter Activities**

*Specific Issues – Open West Mountain for winter activities
 Provide/improve winter activities
 Snowmobiling
 Cross-country skiing
 Snowshoeing*

Discussions: Winter activities are generally determined (i.e., limited) according to the areas that are plowed. As noted above, the lack of significant parking areas for snowmobilers along West Mountain Road is causing people to park in driveways and to obstruct traffic. Existing parking areas, such as the Anderson Creek trail head reach capacity rapidly. It was noted by an AHWG member that WestRock will affect this as well. Additional accommodation for winter uses is needed, through undertaking the following measures:

- Establish a program to identify and prioritize locations for providing additional parking/access; such a program should clearly define where parking will occur, how users will access areas where recreation activities are occurring from the parking areas, and what other facilities are necessary such as restrooms. Activities to be considered include: snowmobiling, cross-country skiing, ice fishing, and winter camping
- Specifically provide additional parking and staging areas for snowmobile users on the west side, including north of Tamarack Falls bridge (Note: it is recognized that Reclamation's land base is limited north of Tamarack Falls Bridge. Nevertheless, options should be explored cooperatively with other managing agencies);
- Plow/clear (more) existing parking lots at points around the reservoir;
- Provide clear circulation management in parking areas (i.e., ingress and egress designation, monitoring and enforcement—needed to promote safety);
- Explore opportunities for more developed winter campsites, such as Osprey Point, where Reclamation and Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation (IDPR) are installing yurts (as an interim measure, pending confirmation through the RMP process) to accommodate both winter and summer group uses; and
- Explore potential for increasing user fees to help offset increased cost for plowing and management.

Planning Team Notes: Objectives 2.2.11 and 3.4.6 of the existing RMP anticipated providing expanded winter access and use facilities. However, the RMP included no specific program or priorities for accomplishing this intent. The RMP Update process will use the existing RMP objectives, current public input, and other relevant sources to explore specific needs and priorities related to winter recreation; and an action program will be developed.

C. OTHER LAND USES & LAND MANAGEMENT

Problem Statements: C.1 – General Land Use Environmental Character

Issue Category: C.1.1 – Re-evaluate Designations of Areas (Conservation/Open Space [C/OS], Rural Residential [RR], Recreation [R], and Wildlife Management Areas [WMAs])

Discussions: The primary points made during discussion of this issue include: [1] For Recreation areas, focus first on areas designated in the existing RMP; expand or develop these areas first to meet demand, [2] Provide designated shoreline access corridors or points through C/OS and WMA areas (i.e., at selected locations such as Medicare Point, Crown Point, and Vista Point); [3] Open WMAs for use by electric motor vehicles; and [4] Use shoreline housing density to evaluate appropriateness of re-designating C/OS areas to RR designation. It is also noted that the main reasons cited for considering items 2, 3 and 4 are to allow the elderly and disabled to access the shoreline and WMA resources, often from residential areas separated from the lake by C/OS or WMA lands (items 2 and 3); to allow boat dock permits to be considered for landowners who are separated from the shore by C/OS lands (item 4—i.e., boat dock permits are only permitted under the current plan in RR areas); to allow second tier land owners to have access to the reservoir (example Morning Drive subdivision). AHWG members who represent these concerns provided specific locations on maps of the study area. For further perspective on these concerns, see B.2.2—Boat Docks/Moorage, and B.3.6—Off Road Vehicle Use.

Planning Team Notes: Providing designated shoreline access corridors/points through C/OS and WMA areas should be part of the alternatives analysis. The RMP Update process, at its most basic level, involves re-evaluation of land use designations. The above perspectives, along with other discussions herein, will be used in this re-evaluation, including consideration of alternatives for updating the RMP land use designations. Also relevant to this assessment are objectives in the existing RMP related to land use compatibility and the need for various types of buffer zones—see Existing RMP Objectives 1.1.3, 3.1.1, 3.1.2, and 3.1.4.

Issue Category: C.1.2 – Create Zones for Different Uses (i.e., wildlife, residential, open space, recreation)

See Issue Category – C.11 (Re-evaluate Land Use Designations), above for Discussion and Planning Team Notes.

Issue Category: C.1.3 – Management to Promote Balanced Usage

See Issue Category – C.11 (Re-evaluate Land Use Designations), above for Discussion and Planning Team Notes.

Issue Category: C.1.4 – Expand Private Use of Reclamation Lands to Improve Management

Discussions: No further discussion has taken place on this issue.

Planning Team Notes: The intent and meaning of this comment are unclear and the AHWG is not able to provide additional perspective. Pending further information, this issue will not be carried forward in the RMP Update process.

Issue Category: C.1.5 – Concern with Over Use of the Reservoir

Discussions: Perspectives on this concern are provided in other discussions contained herein, including: B.1.4—Create Zones for Different Recreation Activities, B.1.6--Avoid Use Conflicts, and B.2.4--Environmental Impacts of Increased Boating.

Planning Team Notes: During the analysis of RMP alternatives, the effects of recreation or other development on resource carrying capacity, both reservoir wide and in specific areas, will be reviewed. The results of this assessment should be used in determining the final RMP Update.

Issue Category: C.1.6 – Keep Area Low-key

Discussions: Within the scope of this RMP Update, both this concern and that stated in C.1.7, below are aimed at ensuring that response to demand for recreation or other development does not destroy the resources and environmental character which has made Cascade a place where people want to live and recreate.

Issue Category: C.1.7 – Maintain Overall Pristine Environment

Discussions: See C.1.6, above.

Issue Category: C.1.8 – Strengthen Economy (including needs of merchants and WestRock)

Discussions: Explore and implement opportunities for concessions to provide /accommodate recreation services. For example: fuel at the north end of the reservoir, overnight camping areas, moorage/dock facilities, and equipment rentals. An AHWG member stated that the main point is the RMP should do anything it can to promote jobs and business in the area and include an objective or policy which reflects this intent.

Planning Team Notes: The potential role of concessionaires is reflected in Objective C.1.8 of the existing RMP. The RMP Update process could include specific candidate services and locations for concession agreements, including the Cascade marina. Also, the RMP can include a general objective to promote private enterprise to the extent feasible within the mission, regulations, and prior agreements governing Reclamation's activities.

Issue Category: C.1.9 – Noise control (Noise pollution from ATVs specifically mentioned)

Discussions: Noise from ATVs, motorcycles, power boats, and personal watercraft are cited as the main sources of concern. A specific area noted in discussion where noise from recreational activity is a problem is Boulder Creek; residents report high noise levels associated with power boating, water skiing, etc. Problems from noise occur off Reclamation lands in the Boulder Creek area also, such as the old railroad grade.

Planning Team Notes: In the existing RMP, the following objectives are relevant to noise concerns: 2.3.2, 2.3.4-5, 2.3.7 (addressing use conflicts, including noise-related concerns) and 4.2.1-4.2.4 (addressing preparation and enforcement of regulations, including noise control). It appears that the existing RMP includes necessary objectives to address noise issues, but is not specific regarding locations and noise sources. Input received from the public during the RMP Update process can be used to more specifically define the problem and its locations. The County currently does not have a noise ordinance. Enforcement of noise concerns would have to reside with IDPR in the recreation areas and with the County if other ordinances are in place.

Issue Category: C.1.10 – Litter Clean-up (e.g., on beaches)

Discussions: Pursue new approaches/technologies for litter management, including making dumpsters bear proof, and educating visitors regarding this issue. IDPR indicates that there are 22 dumpsters in place around the reservoir, at least one at each recreation site. They do have some problems with local residents filling these with construction debris and other household waste. Overall, however, litter management does not seem to be a widespread issue. In fact, the major “litter” management problem IDPR sees is dead fish (i.e., “trash” fish such as suckers and squawfish) on the beaches. IDPR does not think additional fish cleaning stations would help with this problem.

Planning Team Notes: The existing RMP does not address provision of dumpsters or specific approaches to litter management. Objective 1.5.2 calls for clean-up of waste dumps and objective 4.2.1 allows for adoption of litter guidelines and regulations. The RMP Update may need to be more specific in setting objectives and implementation actions to address the above concerns.

Issue Category: C.1.11 – Regulation of Devil Worshipping on Reclamation Property

Discussions: No further discussion has taken place on this issue.

Planning Team Notes: No additional information on this concern has been forthcoming through public discussion. For planning purposes, such public activity/behavior concerns as this will be addressed under the general concepts of land use management and law enforcement; the specific activity mentioned will thus not be carried forward in the process.

Problem Statements: C.2 – Conservation/Open Space Areas (C/OS)

Discussions Related to Issue categories C.1.1 - C.2.4, below: Many perspectives have been expressed regarding the future status of existing C/OS areas. The issue statements contained here describe several of these perspectives. Some members of the public have stressed that existing C/OS areas should be preserved, especially considering the increased and increasing subdivision activity around the reservoir. Other points of view include opening at least some of these areas for designated ORV trails (e.g., at Boulder Creek and Vista Point), allowing boat docks in some areas, and reclassifying some areas to RR based on development activity since the existing RMP was adopted. Further perspective on these latter points of view are provided in C.1.1 – Re-evaluate Designations of Areas, and in the other discussion cited therein.

Planning Team Notes Related to Issue categories C.1.1 - C.2.4, below: As noted in Issue Category C.1.1 (Reevaluate Land Use Designations), re-evaluation of all land use designation is a fundamental part of the RMP Update process. In performing this re-evaluation, it is relevant to note that the C/OS areas in the current RMP were originally established to (1) serve as a buffer between RR areas and WMAs, and (2) to preserve blocks of open space around the reservoir as a counter balance to the level of residential development which has historically occurred and which is continuing. In considering the future status of existing C/OS areas, it will be relevant to keep in mind a range of related concerns expressed by the public, including all of those listed under Problem Statement C.1 (General Land Use and Environmental Character). Education on the purposes of the C/OS areas should also be considered if they are carried forward in the Update.

Issue Category: C.2.1 -- Preserve C/OS Areas and Define Designation Qualifications

Issue Category: C.2.2 -- Create C/OS Buffer Zones Between Private Property and Recreation Zones

Issue Category: C.2.3 -- C/OS Opened for Other Uses (especially for boat docks)

Issue Category: C.2.4 -- Examine if C/OS Zones have Become Rural Residential (RR)

Problem Statements: C.3 – Agriculture and Grazing

Issue Category: C.3.1 -- Eliminate Grazing on Flatlands

Discussions: See Issue Category – A.2.1 (Protect/Enhance Water Quality), above.

Planning Team Notes: It should be noted as a result of the existing RMP (see Objective 1.2.1) all grazing leases on Reclamation lands have been terminated. The only grazing which now occurs is associated with the permanent agricultural easements on Reclamation property. Reclamation has conducted (and is continuing) a voluntary program with easement holders to fence cattle from the shore zone, including offering funding for the fences. Some easement holders have participated in this

program; others have not. Reclamation's only other alternative in cases where easement holders do not wish to participate in this voluntary program is to condemn the easements on the basis of water quality concerns; such action has not been considered justified or defensible to date.

Issue Category: C.3.2 -- Stop Grazing Below High Water Mark

Specific Issues – Use of additional fencing (including responsibility for funding)

Discussions: See Issue Categories – A.2.1 (Protect/Enhance Water Quality) and C.3.1 (Eliminate Grazing on Flatlands), above.

Issue Category: C.3.3 -- Prohibit Agricultural Practices on Reclamation Lands

Discussions and Planning Team Notes: See Issue Categories – A.2.1 (Protect/Enhance Water Quality) and C.3.1 (Eliminate Grazing on Flatlands), above. No agriculture is occurring on Reclamation land except within the permanent agricultural easements. On those easements, owners have the right to conduct agriculture.

Issue Category: C.3.4 -- Continue Agricultural Use

Discussions: No further discussion has taken place on this perspective.

Planning Team Notes: It is relevant to note that the existing RMP focused on eliminating the adverse water quality impacts of grazing on Reclamation land, however, as stated in Objective 1.2.1 of the existing RMP, the potential value of limited grazing for vegetation management, wildlife values, and fire hazard reduction was recognized. This perspective needs to be discussed further, however, on agricultural easements owners have the right to conduct agricultural activities.

Problem Statements: C.4 – Crown Point

Planning Team Notes for C.4.1 - C.4.4 (All Crown Point Issue Categories): The RMP Update must take a more detailed look at alternatives for access to/through and development of the Crown Point area (i.e., west and north of the existing recreation site). Also, there are members of the public and the AHWG who would like to see this area designated as C/OS, and thus preserved in open space without recreation development. The existing RMP called for extension of the current campground, two additional RV campgrounds, boat launch and parking, a group campground for RVs and a group campground for tent campers, and for development of a trail system in this area. The railroad grade was proposed as the access road for the additional development. However, the access road was not proposed to connect with the adjacent subdivision. Also options such as continuation of the quarry in operation and development of an amphitheater or visitor center, etc. were not part of the existing RMP. Public and AHWG comments indicate the need to review such new and more detailed alternatives. The concepts contained in the existing RMP as well as those listed below should be arrayed and considered in the RMP alternatives analysis process.

Note: It has been determined by the State Historic Preservation Officer that this section of the railroad grade is eligible for the National Historic Register. This does not preclude development, but would require special attention to mitigation measures depending on what development is proposed.

Issue Category: C.4.1 -- Need for Additional Reservoir Access from Crown Point

Discussions: The desire for ATV access to the shoreline from the Crown Point subdivision, in particular for elderly or disabled individuals who would like to fish, has been expressed (see B.3.6 for additional perspective in this issue).

Issue Category: C.4.2 -- Uses for Crown Point Railroad Grade -- Explore all Possibilities

Specific Issues –
Designate Crown Point railroad grade as non-motorized trail
Place road on Crown Point railroad grade
Crown Point opened for emergency vehicles only

Discussions: The option of using the Crown Point railroad grade as a County road should be considered and has received considerable support in public input thus far. Proponents of this alternative stress that this could reduce traffic on the road across the dam, as well as improve emergency access to the area. Questions regarding snowmobile use of the railroad grade have also been raised. Considerable public input has also been received requesting that the railroad grade be retained as a non-motorized facility, including such uses as hiking and bicycling.

Issue Category: C.4.3 -- Development of a Crown Point Amphitheater

Discussions: This suggestion was to use the quarry site for an amphitheater. Also, a Lake Cascade Visitors Center has been noted as an option for Crown Point.

Planning Team Notes: It should be noted that the quarry must be reserved and available for project purposes such as refacing the dam. This requirement would preclude any permanent structure being located at this site.

Issue Category: C.4.4 -- Maintaining Use of Crown Point Rock Quarry by all Agencies that Need Rock

Discussions: No further discussion has taken place on this issue.

Planning Team Notes: The existing RMP anticipated that the quarry could be used as source of rock centering on Reclamation uses at the reservoir; breakwaters, developing offshore islands and channel side ponds to enhance habitat in WMAs. The existing RMP also calls for preparation of a rehabilitation plan for the quarry site under Objective 1.5.4 to protect scenic quality and open space values. As stated above in C.4.3, any use of quarry materials will have to be evaluated against the need to reserve and use the rock for project purposes.

Problem Statements: C.5 – Surrounding Land Use/Management**Issue Category: C.5.1 -- Trespassing on Adjacent Private Lands/Consistent Enforcement**

Discussions: Private landowners request direct contact with the Sheriff to enforce trespass regulations. It is possible that many cases of trespass are simply due to people not being aware that they are trespassing; better public education and signage could help reduce this problem.

Planning Team Notes: Regulation of trespass onto private property is within the County's jurisdictional control, rather than Reclamation. Landowners and residents do have direct access to the Sheriff's office for enforcement of existing regulations. Further discussion may be necessary to determine whether existing County regulations in this regard are adequate to address current concerns and problems which may arise due to public use of Reclamation lands and facilities.

The existing RMP contains several objectives and programs aimed at minimizing the potential for trespass problems. These include:

- Objectives 3.4.3 and 3.4.4, which focus on making sure that planning for (1) access to Reclamation lands/facilities or (2) measures to control such access do not have inadvertent impacts on private lands;
- Objective 4.2.1, which lists the types of user guidelines to be developed and published;
- Objectives 4.3.1 and 4.3.2, which focus on providing adequate signage and public information (including maps) to educate the public regarding the locations of private property; and
- Provision for installation of fencing where trespass is a definite problem.

As part of the RMP Update, further discussion may be needed regarding (1) the adequacy of the above objectives/provisions contained in the current RMP, and/or (2) specific needs for signage, fencing, and public information to minimize trespass.

Issue Category: C.5.2 -- Encroachments on Reclamation Lands by Adjacent Private Property Owners

Discussions: Assure consistency of policy and enforcement in any program to address encroachments. In any case, the impact of allowing encroachments must be considered, including concern that allowing lawns can contribute to water quality problems.

Planning Team Notes: The existing RMP allows for private "recreational" use of the narrow strip of Reclamation land along the water in RR areas (including a boat dock), subject to a review, approval, and permitting process; however, no private uses are allowed in C/OS, WMA, or Recreation areas (see Goal 3.2, Objective 3.2.1 and Section 5.5.4 of the existing RMP). In considering landowner proposals for use of Reclamation land in RR areas, water quality is one of several factors to be considered by Reclamation in determining whether a permit will be issued. Reclamation is having an independent appraisal completed to determine fair market value of the use of these lands. The appraisal will be used to evaluate permit fees.

The RMP Update process should determine if the goal, objective and actions of the existing RMP are adequate and appropriate to current conditions. If the language of the RMP is considered appropriate, this issue may be another example of the need for a more clearly defined and consistently enforced permit system. It has been noted that there are some boat ramps in the RR area which no one maintains and for which no one claims ownership; this is a good example of the need for adequate enforcement and monitoring.

Refer also to Issue B.2.2-Planning Team Notes Additional Information for Reclamation policy on private use of Reclamation lands.

Issue Category: C.5.3 -- Impacts from Development on Surrounding Lands (WestRock specifically mentioned)

Discussions: Most discussion has centered on the potential impact of WestRock. It is clear that this planning effort must anticipate how the RMP Update for Lake Cascade would be different if WestRock is developed, especially in its treatment of recreation opportunities on the west shore. For example, a preliminary review conducted by IDPR for the Governor's office indicates that most recreation sites near WestRock would likely need to be converted to day use sites; current camping uses would no longer be viable. The development of WestRock will also have a significant effect on current snowmobile access and parking requirements. Other impacts must also be considered, such as construction workers and eventually service employees using the campgrounds and displacing recreation visitors.

The County Commission requested that the RMP effort inform them of the potential impacts of WestRock.

Planning Team Notes: The RMP Update must consider the future both with and without the WestRock development. Based on the current status of the County's WestRock approval process, it is clear that the RMP Update must anticipate development of WestRock and its potential impacts on Lake Cascade. From the RMP process standpoint, these impacts would center on the northwest shore (including the form, viability, and "highest and best use" of current recreation sites and the recreation activities which are most appropriate to the area), but will also influence decisions for other recreation areas around the reservoir (e.g., the potential need to replace campground capacity displaced by conversion of west shore campgrounds to day use, and the need to develop additional boating facilities to accommodate demand from WestRock residents and visitors). In assessing the relationship between WestRock (and other developments around the reservoir) and Reclamation's RMP for Cascade, the cumulative effects of all development will be reviewed in the Environmental Assessment prepared for the RMP Update. Decisions related to Reclamation facilities and resources around the reservoir, as well as facilities which support use of the water surface, will need to be made in this cumulative context. Through the NEPA process, it will also be possible to estimate the degree of influence which projects such as WestRock will have on the reservoir and Reclamation lands.

Issue Category: C.5.4 -- WestRock

Discussions: See Issue Category – C.5.3 (Impacts from Development on Surrounding Lands), above.

Planning Team Notes: Currently there are no formal requests by WestRock to use Reclamation lands; however, Reclamation anticipates working with WestRock in respect to water rights and access for utilities. However, as noted above, opportunities and requirements for coordination of the RMP Update and the WestRock plans will become more apparent, especially as the RMP NEPA document is prepared.

Issue Category: C.5.5 -- Designation of Private Lands Around Boulder Creek Area to Rural Residential

Discussions: See Issue Category – C.1.1 (Re-evaluate Designations of Areas), and B.2.2 (Boat Docks), above.

D. OPERATION, MANAGEMENT, AND IMPLEMENTATION

Problem Statements: D.1 – Reservoir Operations and Management

Issue Category: D.1.1 – Educate Public on Reservoir Management

Discussions: Many of the concerns noted below regarding reservoir operations can be adequately addressed through public education regarding operations requirements and methods. Options for disseminating operations information (as well as information on RMP programs) include: annual meetings to review operations with the public, pamphlets, signs and information kiosks (perhaps at each recreation site and at the dam) describing reservoir operations, a web site (either at Reclamation or through linkage to local sites such as that developed by the high school), a short video, and exhibits at facilities such as the Discovery Center in Boise. Information could be distributed through the Chamber of Commerce and local organizations such as the Rotary Club. The appropriate RMP Update section should also describe reservoir operations, requirements, and methods.

Planning Team Notes: The existing RMP contains a brief description of reservoir operations and requirements. However, based on AHWG discussion, more detailed information is needed to educate the public regarding the “whys” and “whens” of operations. Also, this information should be made more widely available, rather than being contained only in the full RMP document; and it should be updated in some form as conditions change. This latter point is particularly relevant given the ongoing dynamic related to the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) endangered species recovery programs related to salmon and their potential impact on Lake Cascade operations. The above suggestions regarding RMP content and provision of public information should be considered for inclusion in the RMP Update (see also Issue Category – D.4.6 [Continuation of Public Involvement after RMP Completion and During Implementation]).

Issue Category: D.1.2 – Impacts of Proposed Drawdown by National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)

Discussions: No further discussion has taken place on this issue.

Planning Team Notes: As noted in existing discussions, operation of the reservoir is not within the RMP span of control. However, objectives such as avoiding impact from drawdowns or maintaining consistent water levels such as those cited in Issue Category D.1.3 (Maintenance of Consistent Water Levels—Keep Reservoir Levels Up), below, can be included to provide advisory guidance to reservoir operators so that recreation, water quality, and fisheries needs can be taken into account while meeting contractual, legal, and flood control obligations. The NMFS process related to endangered species could result in legal requirements which would affect reservoir operation.

Issue Category: D.1.3 – Maintenance of Consistent Water Levels—Keep Reservoir Levels Up)

Discussions: Pursue permanent designation/reservation of a 300,000 acre-feet minimum pool.

Planning Team Notes: Refer to Issue Category – D.1.2 (Impacts of Proposed Drawdown by National Marine Fisheries Service [NMFS]), above. Objectives 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 of the existing RMP reflect the desire to maintain a 300,000 acre-feet minimum pool and to keep water levels as high as possible as long as possible into the recreation season. The RMP Update can reinforce the goals of keeping water levels up in the summer for recreation, fisheries, and water quality; however, it must take into account the other legal requirements that the reservoir operations must meet such as contractual obligations, flood control, and additional water for salmon.

Issue Category: D.1.4 – Do Not Lower Reservoir Levels for Endangered Species (salmon)

Discussions: No further discussion has taken place on this issue.

Planning Team Notes: Refer to Issue Category – D.1.2 (Impacts of Proposed Drawdown by National Marine Fisheries Service [NMFS]), above.

Issue Category: D.1.5 – Environmental Impacts of Power Plant at the Dam

Discussions: AHWG members discussing this topic have not heard that power plant operations cause any significant impact.

Planning Team Notes: Operation of the Cascade power plant is not a consideration in the RMP, just as overall reservoir operations are not subject to change through the RMP.

Problem Statements: D.2 – Access

Issue Category: D.2.1 – Road Congestion

Discussions: Locations of road congestion cited in discussion include the following:

- City boat ramp in Cascade, occurring at the confluence of three roadways;
- The area around Crown Point campground and where the winter lot is located;
- Intersection of W. Roseberry and Highway 55; and
- Donnelly City boat ramp (proper signage was cited as the solution here).

It should be noted that the intersection of W. Roseberry Road and Highway 55 (the main intersection in Donnelly) is not on Reclamation lands and therefore is outside the scope of Reclamation's jurisdiction.

It was also noted that Reclamation is considering closing the road over the dam to vehicular access due to security concerns. If this is the case, it may be an opportunity to tie this route into the City's greenbelt system.

Planning Team Notes: Outside of Federal land around the reservoir, the County and the State are responsible for roadway conditions and improvements. As part of preparing the existing RMP, an assessment was conducted of the impact which the RMP alternatives would have on the surrounding roadway system; no significant potential for impact was found for the adopted RMP alternative during this assessment. Also, the RMP contains an objective (3.4.1) which expresses Reclamation’s intention to “cooperate with the State and County in their efforts to achieve needed improvements...”. The Environmental Assessment which will be prepared as part of the RMP Update process will again analyze the potential impacts on road congestion of any proposals for modification/expansion of recreation and other facilities. Through this process, any need for improvements in the surrounding road system which are attributable to the RMP alternatives will be identified; and roadway improvements needed to mitigate these impacts will be identified. If this process shows that RMP alternatives would impact the road system, the cost and feasibility of necessary mitigation measures will be a factor in deciding on a final RMP.

Issue Category: D.2.2 – Maintain Access at Status Quo

Discussions: No further discussion has taken place on this issue.

Planning Team Notes: Maintaining the status quo is an option which will be considered during the Environmental Assessment process as the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative essentially means no change from the existing RMP—in any regard. Whether or not this approach to access is appropriate in other RMP Update alternatives will depend on the nature of improvements/developments included in these alternatives.

Issue Category: D.2.3 – Address Access During Drawdown Periods

Discussions: Some boat ramps need to be extended to provide better boat access during drawdown periods (e.g., Poison Creek). Dick Schoonover (Valley County Waterways Committee) provided the AHWG and the Planning Team with a list of ramps which should be considered for extension.

Planning Team Notes: Objective 2.1.5 of the existing RMP speaks of ensuring that “key” ramps in high demand areas are long enough to be used through the fall recreation season. The RMP Update may wish to revise this objective based on current needs and to establish a clear priority list of ramps which do not meet the objective.

Issue Category: D.2.4 – Improve/Increase Access to Sites (including Americans with Disabilities Act [ADA] access)

Discussions: The primary concerns discussed by the AHWG are noted in B.3.6—Off-Road Vehicle Use. Some AHWG members had special concern for disabled access to the shoreline between Vista Point and Crown Point. Others remarked that disabled access should be considered all the way around the reservoir and access opportunities should exist for all users. In general, it was also noted that compliance with ADA requirements are required in all new Reclamation recreation development, and retrofits are occurring where feasible given funding constraints.

Planning Team Notes: Objective 3.4.5 of the existing RMP addresses provision of “barrier free” access at all appropriate Reclamation facilities. In fact, this access consideration is incorporated into the design process for Reclamation facilities (facilities on Reclamation lands). This consideration will be carried forward into the RMP Update.

Issue Category: D.2.5 – Access for Wildlife Viewing

See Issue Category – A.4.1 (Develop Interpretive Environmental Education Areas).

Issue Category: D.2.6 – Off-Road Vehicle (ORV) Access

Discussions: See Issue Category – B.3.6 (ORV Use).

Planning Team Notes: See Issue Category – B.3.6 (ORV Use).

Problem Statements: D.3 – Management, Coordination, and Regulation

Discussions: There is a general concern surrounding the need for consistent regulations and enforcement. Many issues related to such uses as ATV/ORV use, access in general, trespass, etc. may be substantially resolved with better public education and consistent, vigilant enforcement. Reclamation should clearly articulate use regulations and restrictions (and keep them simple), educate the public regarding these regulations and restrictions, and ensure rigorous enforcement.

Planning Team Notes: At several points herein, the need for more clearly defined regulations, procedures and permit processes has been noted, as well as the need for more detail regarding the “when, where, and how” of such provisions. Also, as noted by the AHWG, enforcement is a key requirement in implementing such regulations, procedures and permit processes. The existing RMP contains Goals, Objectives and actions adequate to address many of the concerns listed in this Problem Statement; the fact that these are still considered to be concerns by the public points toward the need for more consistent and visible enforcement (i.e., rather than new or substantially revised RMP language).

The existing RMP recognized that Reclamation does not have enforcement authority and thus must obtain enforcement support through arrangements with other agencies, such as Valley County (see Objective 4.2.3). Currently, IDPR provides some enforcement in recreation areas and will continue to do so as part of the RMP Update. Reclamation must still pursue cooperative arrangements with Valley County for enforcement of trespass, noise or other regulations in C/OS, RR, and WMA areas. In the latter regard, options for the future include: (1) ensuring that needed new regulations and ordinances which can only be adopted and enforced by Valley County are in fact put in place and are enforced (e.g., noise ordinances), or (2) continuing to pursue through Congress necessary authorities for Reclamation (such as land use regulation, enforcement, land exchange, etc).

The existing RMP (Objective 4.2.1) lists the types of regulations and guidelines which were to be developed in implementing that RMP. This list should be made more comprehensive in the RMP

Update (i.e., including such topics as erosion control design, allowed uses in RR areas, etc.); the Update should also specify (1) when and by whom the regulations and guidelines will be developed and adopted, (2) what agency will provide enforcement and oversight, and (3) how appropriate funding and personnel will be provided to accomplished enforcement.

See discussion under Issue Category: D.3.2 (Coordination Among Agencies for Sound, Efficient Management) for additional perspective in these regards.

Issue Category: D.3.1 – Coordination Between Property Owners and Reclamation RR Lands (long term owners rights, existing leases extended)

Discussions: No further discussion has taken place on this issue.

Planning Team Notes: Since specifics regarding this concern were not defined during discussions to date, no further insight into potential responses in the RMP Update can be provided.

Issue Category: D.3.2 – Coordination Among Agencies for Sound, Efficient Management

Discussions: No further discussion has taken place on this issue.

Planning Team Notes: Cooperation and coordination with involved agencies is a theme contained in several sections of the existing RMP, and will be an important theme for the RMP Update. Aspects of this cooperation which are addressed in the existing RMP include: adoption and enforcement of a noise ordinance, adoption and enforcement of no-wake zones, regulations related to personnel watercraft, float planes, and parasailing activities, identification of and public information regarding water hazards, planning and development of trails and other recreation facilities, management of fish and wildlife resources, fire management and response, provision of additional enforcement personnel, and specific recreation lease agreements. The RMP Update process should review cooperation and coordination requirements and update them as needed to address current condition (e.g., incorporate the new role of IDPR); and should seek to add detail regarding implementation priorities, methods, schedules, funding sources, etc.

Issue Category: D.3.3 – Consistent Management, Policies, and Enforcement from Reclamation

See general discussion and team notes under Problem Statements D.3, and specific discussion and notes under Issue Category – D.3.2 (Coordination Among Agencies for Sound, Efficient Management), above.

Issue Category: D.3.4 – Consistent Standards/Guidelines for Development to Minimize Impacts

See general discussion and team notes under Problem Statements D.3, and specific discussion and notes under Issue Category – D.3.2 (Coordination Among Agencies for Sound, Efficient Management), above.

Issue Category: D.3.5 – Rights and Procedures for Private Facilities

Discussions: See Issue Category – C.5.2 (Encroachments on Reclamation Lands by Private Owners), above. Otherwise, there was no significant discussion of this concern at the AHWG meeting and no further perspective can be provided.

Planning Team Notes: See Issue Category – C.5.2 (Encroachments on Reclamation Lands by Private Owners), above.

Issue Category: D.3.6 – Keeping Regulation by Government Agencies at a Minimum

Discussions: No further discussion has taken place on this issue.

Planning Team Notes: This sentiment can be recognized in the RMP Update to the extent that it does not conflict with legal requirements and fulfillment of government responsibilities.

Problem Statements: D.4 – Implementation

Issue Category: D.4.1 – Ensuring RMP Implementation

Discussions: Ensure that RMP actions and programs are attainable, and that updated RMP policies, regulations, and/or restrictions are enforceable. The AHWG cautions that good ideas and visions for Cascade should not be eliminated simply because adequate funding sources or solutions to enforcement are not readily apparent. Instead, the RMP should distinguish between those actions which are clearly attainable within the horizon of the plan (and include specific implementation programs to accomplish them) and those actions/visions which are desired pending identification of feasible ways to achieve them.

Planning Team Notes: These points are self-explanatory and should be carried forward directly through the RMP Update process.

Issue Category: D.4.2 – Establishing Priorities

Discussions: Develop a process for defining implementation priorities then set priorities and rigorously pursue achieving them.

Planning Team Notes: The existing RMP contains an implementation and phasing program (Section 5.7 of existing RMP). Reclamation has attempted to follow this program throughout the 10 year life of that RMP. However, in many cases, availability of staffing or funding, changing conditions, or other factors have influenced the feasibility or desirability of pursuing implementation as portrayed in the RMP. The RMP Update will need to prioritize actions, as done in the existing RMP and as emphasized currently by the AHWG; it should also attempt to better estimate and program funding, staffing and other needed resources in order to determine the feasibility of implementing these priorities. Coordination with managing partners will be key to a successful implementation plan.

Issue Category: D.4.3 – Funding for RMP Proposals and RMP Implementation

Specific Issues – Potential for collaboration with "self-funded" groups such as Good Sam Club
Availability of public and private grants
Cost sharing arrangements
Other cooperative efforts
Recreation use fees:

- abolish recreation site fees for local residents
- provision for Tribal use of facilities
- minimize recreation fees (use of boat docks, campgrounds)

Discussions: Funding for new recreation facilities is difficult; creative efforts will be needed (such as cooperative public/private programs, use of concessions, etc.); and, as noted previously, all recreation development which is to receive Reclamation funding must have 50-50 non-Federal cost share partners. Wildlife habitat enhancements will require a 75-25 Federal / non-Federal cost share partner. It is important to educate the public on how fees are being used (e.g., for snow plowing). There is concern regarding the justification for charging use fees for parking areas or facilities such as boat ramps which were paid for by Valley County Waterways Committee.

Also, involved Indian Tribes request that the RMP Update process consider, and if appropriate, include provisions for Tribal members to use the recreation facilities at no charge. The Tribe is working on a Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU) with the U.S. Forest Service for tribal members to not pay for camping, based on the tribe wanting to camp on the Salmon River during Chinook harvest season. It has, however, been noted that this may be a Reclamation wide issue, and not one just to be addressed at Lake Cascade.

Planning Team Notes: See Issue Category – D.4.2 (Establishing Priorities), above. Use of a variety of funding sources and cooperative efforts will undoubtedly be necessary to achieve the priorities of the RMP Update. As noted above, efforts should be made to clearly establish a funding approach for each major component of the RMP, or to clearly identify those visions or actions which are desired, but for which funding cannot currently be identified.

Regarding user fees, the AHWG recognizes that user fees are a necessary part of operation and maintenance of facilities. The RMP Update, however, could include more complete information

regarding how various fee levels are established and how fee revenues are used. In addition, Reclamation has reviewed the Tribes' request for waiver of fees for Tribal members and has determined that the most appropriate mechanism for responding to the Tribe's request would be a special use permit. Such a permit might be arranged for a special event and would need to be considered on a short-term, case-by-case basis. Reclamation's existing agreement with IDPR to manage the recreation sites relies in part on user fees to support facilities maintenance; therefore, any waiver of these fees must be looked at carefully.

Issue Category: D.4.4 – Enforcement of Policies, Regulations, Restrictions, etc.

See general discussion and team notes under Problem Statements D.3.

Issue Category: D.4.5 – Need for legislation/actions by other agencies

See general discussion and team notes under Problem Statements D.3.

Issue Category: D.4.6 – Continuation of Public Involvement after RMP Completion, During Implementation

Discussions: Conduct a public RMP status meeting once per year that includes the following:

- Obtain public comments (both positive and negative) and answer questions regarding reservoir management efforts and implementation of the RMP;
- Review reservoir operations plans and requirements; and
- Illustrate, using RMP implementation time line, where we stand in implementing the RMP (include an implementation time line as part of the RMP).

Also, make sure that landowners potentially effected by RMP projects are informed of plans and allowed to participate in project implementation planning.

Planning Team Notes: Incorporation of these concepts into the RMP Update should be considered. It has also been suggested that a yearly water operations presentation could be included with the RMP status meeting (see Issue Category D.1.1– Educate Public on Reservoir Management).

Issue Category: D.4.7 – Change Name to Lake Cascade

This has been accomplished.

Appendix B

Agency and Tribal Consultation/Coordination



Appendix B-1

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Consultation/Coordination



Appendix B-1. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Coordination and Consultation

The following items are included in this appendix:

1. Letter from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) on threatened and endangered species consultation
2. Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report
3. Biological Assessment Amendment

This document is available as hardcopy and is on file at the Bureau of Reclamation.

Appendix B-2
Tribes



This document is available as a hardcopy and is on file at the Bureau of Reclamation.

Appendix C
Lease Agreement



This document is available as hardcopy and is on file at the Bureau of Reclamation.

Appendix D
Legal Mandates



Legal Mandates Potentially Applicable to the EA and RMP

Reclamation is required to comply with a number of legal mandates in the preparation and implementation of the RMP. The following is a list of the environmental laws, executive orders, and policies that may have an effect on the RMP or Reclamation actions in the implementation of the plan:

Law, Executive Order, or Policy	Description
Accessibility for Persons with Disabilities – Reclamation Policy (November 18, 1998)	Established a Pacific Northwest regional policy to assure that all administrative offices, facilities, services, and programs open to the public, utilized by Federal employees, and managed by Reclamation, a managing partner, or a concessionaire, are fully accessible for both employees and the public.
American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978	Provides for freedom of Native Americans to believe, express, and exercise their traditional religion, including access to important sites.
Archaeological Resources Protection Act (ARPA) of 1979, as amended	Ensures the protection and preservation of archaeological sites on Federal land. ARPA requires that Federal permits be obtained before cultural resource investigations begin on Federal land. It also requires that investigators consult with the appropriate Native American groups before conducting archaeological studies on Native American origin sites.
Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act of 1974	Provides for the preservation of historical buildings, sites, and objects of national significance.
Clean Water Act (CWA) of 1974, as amended*	Provides for protection of water quality.
Clean Air Act (CAA) of 1970	Provides for protection of air quality.
Department of Defense (DoD) American Indian and Alaska Native Policy, October 20, 1998	The policy supports Tribal self-governance and government-to-government relations between the Federal government. It specifies that DoD will meet its trust responsibilities to Tribes and will address Tribal concerns related to protected Tribal resources, Tribal rights, and Indian lands.
Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, as amended	Provides for protection of plants, fish, and wildlife that have a designation as threatened or endangered.

Law, Executive Order, or Policy	Description
Executive Order 12875, Enhancing the Intergovernmental Partnership, October 26, 1983	Establishes "regular and meaningful consultation and collaboration with state, local, and Tribal governments on Federal matters that significantly or uniquely affect their communities."
Executive Order 12898, February 11, 1994, Environmental Justice	Requires Federal agencies to consider the effects of its programs and policies on minority and lower income populations.
Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands	Directs all Federal agencies to avoid, if possible, adverse impacts to wetlands and to preserve and enhance the natural and beneficial values of wetlands.
Executive Order 13007, Indian Sacred Sites, May 24, 1996	Provides for access to, and ceremonial use of, Indian sacred sites on Federal lands used by Indian religious practitioners.
Executive Order 13175, Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Government, November 6, 2000 (Page 6-3, Table 6.1-1).	<p>The EO builds on previous administrative actions and is intended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establish regular and meaningful consultation and collaboration with tribal officials in the development of Federal policies that have tribal implications. • Strengthens government-to-government relations with Indian tribes; and • Reduce the imposition of unfounded mandates upon Indian tribes.
Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA) of 1958	Requires consultation and coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Indian Trust Assets Policy (July 1993)	Requires that Reclamation provide protection and continuation of Tribal hunting, fishing, and gathering Treaty Rights.
Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918, as amended	Provides protection for bird species that migrate across state lines.
National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969	Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA specify that as part of the NEPA scoping process, the lead agency "...shall invite the participation of affected Federal, State, and local agencies, any affected Indian tribe,..." (1501.7[a]1."

Law, Executive Order, or Policy	Description
National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended	Section 106 of the NHPA requires Federal agencies to consider the effects of any actions or programs on historic properties. It also requires agencies to consult with Native American Tribes if a proposed Federal action may affect properties to which they attach religious and cultural significance.
Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) of 1990	Regulations for the treatment of Native American graves, human remains, funeral objects, sacred objects, and other objects of cultural patrimony. Requires consultation with Native American Tribes during Federal project planning.
Presidential Memorandum: Government-to-Government Relations with Native American Tribal Governments, April 29, 1994	Specifies a commitment to developing more effective day-to-day working relationships with sovereign Tribal governments. Each executive department and agency shall consult to the greatest extent practicable and to the extent permitted by law, with Tribal governments prior to taking actions affecting Federally recognized Tribal governments.
Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Title V, Section 504	Provides for access to Federal or Federally assisted facilities for the disabled. The Uniform Federal Accessibility Standards (UFAS) or the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG), whichever is the more stringent, are followed as compliance with Section 504.
Title 28, Public Law 89-72, as amended	Provides Reclamation with the authority to cost-share on recreation projects and fish and wildlife enhancement facilities with managing partners on Reclamation lands.

*A permit may need to be required for construction related activities.

Appendix E
Annual Reports and Activities



Appendix E-1
Fiscal Year 2002
(October 2001 - September 2002)
Annual Reports and Activities



Appendix E-2
Fiscal Year 2003
(October 2002 - September 2003)
Annual Reports and Activities



Appendix E-3
Fiscal Year 2004
(October 2003 - September 2004)
Annual Reports and Activities



Appendix E-4
Fiscal Year 2005
(October 2004 - September 2005)
Annual Reports and Activities



Appendix E-5
Fiscal Year 2006
(October 2005 - September 2006)
Annual Reports and Activities



Appendix E-6
Fiscal Year 2007
(October 2006 - September 2007)
Annual Reports and Activities



Appendix E-7
Fiscal Year 2008
(October 2007 - September 2008)
Annual Reports and Activities



Appendix E-8
Fiscal Year 2009
(October 2008 - September 2009)
Annual Reports and Activities



Appendix E-9
Fiscal Year 2010
(October 2009 - September 2010)
Annual Reports and Activities



Appendix E-10
Fiscal Year 2011
(October 2010 - September 2011)
Annual Reports and Activities

