Appendix J: Comments Received on New Melones Lake Area Draft RMP/EIS

Comments

O-7-35: Comment noted. Through the preferred alternative, Reclamation aims to achieve a balance between public use and conservation.

O-7-36: As stated on pages 1-5 and 6-2, subsequent documents tiered to the RMP for activity- and project-level plans would be subject to NEPA analysis and compliance, containing greater detail as necessary. By stating this in the introduction to the RMP/EIS (Chapter 1) as well as in the introduction to the environmental consequences chapter (Chapter 6), Reclamation conveys that further environmental review will be conducted prior to activity or project implementation without including repetitive and redundant language for each applicable case throughout Chapter 6.

O-7-37: Environmental impacts associated with the development of commercial services and concessions, including new or additional marina facilities, will be addressed in further detail in a subsequent Commercial Service Plan being prepared by Reclamation (see pages 2-25 through 2-26, which also indicates criteria that will be considered in planning such facilities).

O-7-38: Impacts on air quality would be further assessed during NEPA review at the implementation level, and appropriate mitigation measures would be proposed, as warranted.

O-7-39: Environmental impacts associated with the development of commercial services and concessions will be addressed in further detail in a subsequent Commercial Service Plan being prepared by Reclamation (see pages 2-25 through 2-26, which also indicates criteria that will be considered in planning such facilities).

Responses

O-7-35: Comment noted. Through the preferred alternative, Reclamation aims to achieve a balance between public use and conservation.

O-7-36: As stated on pages 1-5 and 6-2, subsequent documents tiered to the RMP for activity- and project-level plans would be subject to NEPA analysis and compliance, containing greater detail as necessary. By stating this in the introduction to the RMP/EIS (Chapter 1) as well as in the introduction to the environmental consequences chapter (Chapter 6), Reclamation conveys that further environmental review will be conducted prior to activity or project implementation without including repetitive and redundant language for each applicable case throughout Chapter 6.

O-7-37: Environmental impacts associated with the development of commercial services and concessions, including new or additional marina facilities, will be addressed in further detail in a subsequent Commercial Service Plan being prepared by Reclamation (see pages 2-25 through 2-26, which also indicates criteria that will be considered in planning such facilities).

O-7-38: Impacts on air quality would be further assessed during NEPA review at the implementation level, and appropriate mitigation measures would be proposed, as warranted.

O-7-39: Environmental impacts associated with the development of commercial services and concessions will be addressed in further detail in a subsequent Commercial Service Plan being prepared by Reclamation (see pages 2-25 through 2-26, which also indicates criteria that will be considered in planning such facilities).
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Letter O-7, Continued

Comments

O-7-40: Comment noted. Monitoring and maintenance needs for protection of the environment associated with the development of commercial services and concessions will be addressed in further detail in a subsequent Commercial Service Plan being prepared by Reclamation.

O-7-41: Impacts would be further assessed during NEPA review at the implementation level, and appropriate mitigation measures would be proposed, as warranted.

O-7-42: The referenced actions are intended to cover the range of commercial services and concessions that may be considered by Reclamation; assumption of a significant cumulative impact is speculative at this time. The Commercial Services Plan being prepared by Reclamation will determine the number, type, and duration of concessions necessary to meet the public demand for services and quality recreation opportunities, in accordance with Reclamation management objectives, including natural resources protection.

O-7-43: Environmental impacts associated with the development of commercial services and concessions will be addressed in further detail in a subsequent Commercial Service Plan being prepared by Reclamation (see pages 2-25 through 2-26, which also indicates criteria that will be considered in planning such facilities).

Responses

O-7-40: Comment noted. Monitoring and maintenance needs for protection of the environment associated with the development of commercial services and concessions will be addressed in further detail in a subsequent Commercial Service Plan being prepared by Reclamation.

O-7-41: Impacts would be further assessed during NEPA review at the implementation level, and appropriate mitigation measures would be proposed, as warranted.

O-7-42: The referenced actions are intended to cover the range of commercial services and concessions that may be considered by Reclamation; assumption of a significant cumulative impact is speculative at this time. The Commercial Services Plan being prepared by Reclamation will determine the number, type, and duration of concessions necessary to meet the public demand for services and quality recreation opportunities, in accordance with Reclamation management objectives, including natural resources protection.

O-7-43: Environmental impacts associated with the development of commercial services and concessions will be addressed in further detail in a subsequent Commercial Service Plan being prepared by Reclamation (see pages 2-25 through 2-26, which also indicates criteria that will be considered in planning such facilities).
### Letter O-7, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSERC supports horseback riding as a means of recreation within the New Melones Lake Area. However, CSERC does not support the construction of a new facility to support an equestrian trail riding business as proposed in Action R 32, due to the many likely detrimental environmental impacts such a business would produce for the environment on slopes that drain down into the reservoir. Having a daytime or round-the-clock stable facility would result in highly concentrated manure, water quality run-off problems, flies, smells, and other impacts on the public lands. As has been shown on US Forest Service and National Park Service lands, having an on-site stable increases risk of spreading non-native invasive plants, increases water quality concerns, and results in concentrated equestrian use, rather than dispersed use that reduces environmental impacts. Accordingly, for these reasons, CSERC supports Alternative A for Action R 32 - the no action alternative.</td>
<td>O-7-44: Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the remainder of the Actions under the General Recreation Category that are not listed above, CSERC supports the actions proposed under Alternative D.</td>
<td>O-7-45: Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Aquatic Recreation:**

CSERC supports the actions proposed under Alternative D for the Aquatic Recreation category, with the exception of the actions discussed below:

- Noting that the wake from boats often results in additional shoreline erosion, CSERC supports the inclusion of additional no-wake zones in order to protect water quality in rural habitat areas. Therefore, CSERC supports Alternative C for Action AR 5, AR 15, and AR 24 because they have the most area included as a no-wake zone.

- Motorized watercraft emissions are a known environmental impact, and although newer vessels have made significant improvements in reducing emissions, this type of pollution still affects air and water quality. Watercrafts are also responsible for disturbing sediments in shallow waters, reducing the available oxygen for aquatic habitat. The noise from watercraft also often disturbs wildlife to varying degrees, depending not only on the size of the motor, but also on the activity and the speed of the watercraft. The addition of more motorized boats will contribute to the disturbance of land and aquatic based wildlife, and ultimately this will contribute to some degree to a potential degradation of the existing ecosystems within the affected areas. Before allowing the level of watercraft to substantially increase at New Melones, CSERC urges the Bureau to quantify and mitigate for the environmental impact that the current level of allowed watercraft creates for air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and the rest of the affected environment. Due to the non-specific and non-environmental protocol established by the Bureau in determining the appropriate level of watercraft allowed at New Melones Lake, CSERC opposes the increase in level of water craft proposed in Alternative B and D in Action AR 22 and supports Alternative A (no increase in watercraft) or...
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### Letter O-7, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O-7-48</strong> Alternative C (a decrease in watercraft). However, if appropriate programmatic conditioning of mitigation is spelled out in the plan, then planning for some level of increase in watercraft would not be as negative for the affected environment.</td>
<td>O-7-48: Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O-7-49</strong> CSERC emphasizes that fish are especially vulnerable during spawning and their reproductive success is reduced by disturbances during spawning. CSERC supports the Bureau adopting Alternative C for Action AR 16 and 17: maximizing protection for trout and warm water fish spawning areas.</td>
<td>O-7-49: Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O-7-50</strong> Land Based Recreation CSERC supports the actions proposed under Alternative D as well as the universal actions described for the Land Based Recreation category, with the exception of the Actions discussed below:</td>
<td>O-7-50: Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For reasons listed under the General Recreation comments in this letter for Action R 32, CSERC supports Alternative C for Action LR 16 - continued operation and maintenance of the existing equestrian staging area.</td>
<td>O-7-50: Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Noting that Lower Natural Bridges is one of the caves designated as a significant cave by the Bureau, yet is difficult to restrict access to, CSERC urges the Bureau to take measures to protect the geologic and environmental values of this cave if Alternative D is accepted for Action LR 19. This could be done through increased education to the public at Natural Bridges with signs and increased patrols of the Natural Bridges Area by law enforcement, or it may necessitate a more assertive degree of fencing, penalties for trespass, etc.</td>
<td>O-7-51: Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Without specific details how locations are chosen for new trails and the overall level of new trails and trailheads that is envisioned, as well as for reasons stated for the actions proposed under the topic Westside and Bowie Flat Management Area, CSERC supports Alternative C for Actions LR 21 and LR 22 - optimizing trail connectivity in the listed Management Areas.</td>
<td>O-7-52: Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actions LR 25 and LR 28 both propose the expansion of RV and campground facilities and services under Alternative D. As previously discussed in CSERC’s comments on the proposed expansion and development of new facilities under the General Land Management category, without minimal regulatory language used to describe the way that these new developments will avoid or reduce impacting sensitive habitats and water quality, CSERC at this time supports Alternative C for both of the proposed actions.</td>
<td>O-7-52: Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Repeating our Center’s recommendation explained for Action SSS S 5, CSERC urges the Bureau to adopt Alternative C restricting access to climbing routes near sensitive bat species during bat habitation periods.</td>
<td>O-7-52: Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Letter O-7, Continued  Comments  Responses

- Repeating our Center’s recommendation stated for Action C-4, CSERC urges the Bureau to adopt Alternative C for Action LR43 - controlling access to caves, as the extreme vulnerability of the ecosystems of significant caves may be impossible to recover once damaged.

Interpretive Services and Visitor Information:

CSERC supports the actions proposed under Alternative D as well as the universal actions described for the Interpretive Services and Visitor Information category, with the exception of the Action discussed below:

- In Action IS 7D, the potential development of an amphitheater in Tuttletown Management Area is proposed. Without regulatory language used to describe the way that this development will avoid or reduce impacts to sensitive wildlife areas and/or water quality, CSERC currently supports Alternative C for Action IS 7 - updating and modernizing the Glory Hole management Area outdoor amphitheater to ADA standards.

Political pressure to approve new road access from Copperopolis

As has been fully noted in local newspapers as well as observed by CSERC staff at Bureau meetings, it is apparent that real estate and development interests in Calaveras County as well as elsewhere are collaborating to pressure the Bureau to approve the concept of new road access into New Melones lands. Specifically, these pro-development interests are proposing a new road that would allow recreational and potential motorboat access from the Copperopolis area.

Such a new road has extremely high potential to create major new poaching, major new wildlife disturbance, major new sources of wildfire ignitions, major new sources of dumping, and a wide range of other negative resource impacts in an area that has long been identified as an important wildlife area within the New Melones management area. CSERC strongly, strongly advocates for the Bureau to remain firm in building upon the previous un-implemented management plan for New Melones, the current existing management direction, and the general objectives provided by Bureau staff at public meetings during this latest management plan process.

CSERC urges the Bureau to continue to design management direction at New Melones so that development and road access is concentrated in areas with the least value for at-risk or reclusive wildlife species. CSERC urges the Bureau to consider the administrative

O-7-53: Prior to development, further site-specific review would be conducted to assist in determining the most suitable locations for such facilities that would consider minimization of environmental impacts.

O-7-54: Comment noted.
problems and potential increase of costs that would be associated with the need to have Bureau staff actively manage recreation and resource impacts on the west-southwestern block of lands in the management area if a new road was constructed -- in contrast to the current situation where motorized access is limited. For all of these and many additional management logistics reasons, CSERC urges the Bureau to reject the political pressures being brought to promote a new road from Copperopolis.

CSERC also urges the Bureau to reject pressure from Tuolumne County to provide a higher level of road access along the southern portion of New Melones lands in that county.

Closing summary

In conclusion, CSERC asks that as the Bureau works towards the final decision, that Bureau interdisciplinary team members keep in mind that with a shifting climate combining with the changing population dynamics of California, our aquatic and natural resources are more valuable and more in need of protection now than they ever have been. We urge the Bureau to fully consider the need to prudently balance management at New Melones by limiting recreational expansion, development, or other environmentally-harmful actions that may be enthusiastically supported by commercial or pro-use interests, but that would diminish the overall ecosystem health and visitor satisfaction that is important to the far larger majority of Americans who own New Melones management lands. We encourage the Bureau to limit approval of new expansion and new development to levels that can be assured to sustain the affected environment so that people can continue to visit and value New Melones for the beautiful and diverse place that it is.

Thanks you for considering CSERC’s comments. Our Center looks forward to learning what decisions the Bureau makes for the future of New Melones Lake.

John Buckley, executive director

Julia Stephens, staff associate
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letter O-8</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **From:** Zephyr Whitewater [zrafting@sbcglobal.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 04, 2010 3:29 PM  
**To:** Brockman, Melissa A  
**Subject:** New Melones input |

Dear Melissa,

I would like to support alternative D. And I also would like to request that the Bureau consider multiple use for reserecting the rafting industry if conditions permitted. As you know, the rafting industry was huge prior to the completion of New Melones dam, and this brought millions of dollars annually into the local economies of Calaveras and Tuolomne counties.

O-8-2: Rafting recreation can exist with New Melones, as long as New Melones is kept moderately low until flood control was needed. The best way to guarantee flood control is to have a low reservoir so that if space is needed to store water, it is there. And a low reservoir would allow for whitewater recreation which would benefit the local economies far more than the erroneous estimated of the use of New Melones back when the powers that be were trying to sell the concept.

Multiple use is possible, and would be the best alternative for the local economies and for the general public. Both flat water and whitewater recreation can co-exist.

Bob Ferguson  
President  
Zephyr Whitewater Expeditions  
www.zrafting.com  
1-800-431-3636 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O-8-1: Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-8-2: While Reclamation may consider developing whitewater rafting opportunities, the RMP will be reactionary to Reclamation's operational needs regarding water levels; the RMP does not address management of water levels or flows.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Letter O-9

Comments

From: George Wendt [georgew@oars.com]  
Sent: Monday, January 04, 2010 4:21 PM  
To: Brockman, Melissa A  
Cc: tylerw@oars.com  
Subject: Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement (RMP/EIS) for the New Melones Lake Area

Dear Mr. Vignon:

I understand that you need our input regarding the New Melones Resource Management Plan today. Accordingly, personally and on behalf of O.A.R.S., I would like to record this input for your consideration.

Overall, we are satisfied with the current level of access for motorized boats at Glory Hole and Tuttletown. Nevertheless, we are in favor of Alternative B – Increased Access – with the proviso that choosing this alternative does not mean that we are in favor of new reservoir access from the west or from the Copperopolis area. Visitation at the reservoir, apparently, has never exceeded 800,000 people per year. Angels Camp is very concerned that if you open up the western end of the reservoir, this will just cannibalize existing usage which would take the small existing reservoir usage and hurt the existing marina facilities economically.

O-9-1

We suggest that the Glory Hole Point area be made more accessible for people with physical disabilities. We are in favor of supporting the existing mountain biking areas and we encourage you to work with the City of Angels to facilitate a trail, likely following Angels Creek, from Angels Camp to New Melones. I understand that this trail would be roughly 4.5 miles long and it could help the economy of Angels Camp and all of Calaveras County and it would be a valuable resource for hikers, bicyclists, and possibly equestrians. This could help visitation to the reservoir at a modest cost and would help serve a more diverse population of outdoor visitors.

We also suggest, that – in view of the information that I read in your report regarding rivers and whitewater rafting:

7.1 Introduction

Lakes and rivers have always been a primary focus for outdoor recreation activities, and many outdoor recreational activities are considered water dependent or water enhanced.

7.2 Aquatic Recreation

Current Conditions

New Melones Lake Area is most popular with visitors for its aquatic recreation opportunities. There are approximately 12,500 surface acres of water (at full capacity) available for aquatic recreation. Activities such as fishing, boating, kayaking, whitewater rafting, houseboating, and water skiing all occur on the lake.

that it would be desirable to make rafting more accessible at the eastern end of your resource. Currently, with the Stanislaus River flowing over 3 miles from the Camp Nine Powerhouse to the point where it meets the reservoir just west of Rose Creek, it would be feasible for private or commercial rafters to float that section of river. As you may remember, the Bureau of Reclamation allowed commercial rafting companies to run that section of river from 1990 through 1995 when the reservoir receded because of drought and thousands of visitors per year took advantage of this opportunity. We don’t know how this year’s snowpack will impact reservoir level for 2010, but I do anticipate that within the next 10 years, we will see periods where the

Responses

O-9-1: Comment noted.

O-9-2: Comment noted.

O-9-3: Comment noted.

O-9-4: Comment noted. The permit process is described under 43 CFR 429. Further, this option is currently being analyzed in the development of the Commercial Services Plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>O.9-4 (Continued)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Stanislaus River runs beyond Rose Creek – and possibly as happened in the early 1980s - rafting might be possible all the way to Parrots Ferry. Accordingly, we urge you to plan for how the road at Parrots Ferry can be stabilized and reopened to some point along the existing roadway. Possibly there should be a provision for a parking area and picnic facility in the area just above a point which could be impacted by a full reservoir. Or, possibly, it might be appropriate to provide a temporary parking facility in the area that might be flooded again if the reservoir refill.

Assuming that the old Stanislaus River and New Melones will share the section of canyon between Camp Nine and Parrots Ferry for many years – with a fluctuating boundary between the two - I think that it would be desirable to make provision to allow individuals and outfitters to raft as far down the river as possible before they switched either to sea kayaks or a motorized boat. Last year, my son and I paddled sea kayaks between Rose Creek and Parrots Ferry where we had to carry the boats up the locked gate at the top of the paved road where it intersects Parrots Ferry Road in Tuolumne County. This was very difficult! Although improving the access road, which has sustained some damage from mud and from subsidence, will likely require some significant construction dollars, I believe that this is essential as part of a long-term use plan for New Melones Recreation Area – which should be utilized for more than its reservoir recreation potential.

Thank you for considering our input and please let me know if you would like any further input from us about the potential for recreational rafting and sea kayaking at the eastern end of the New Melones Lake Area. We would like to talk with you about offering some trips there during the 2010 season as we help build a long-term asset for the benefit of visitors to Calaveras and Tuolumne counties.

Sincerely yours,
George Wendt
The O.A.R.S. Family of Companies
PO Box 87 Angelos Camp, CA 95222
Phone: 209-736-4600
Phone: 209-736-4677 ext. 714
Fax: 209-736-2902
www.oars.com
Defining Adventure since 1969

Please consider the natural environment before printing this email message.
O-10-1: Comment noted. The current size limitation of 15’ x 65’ is based on many factors, including but not limited to entrance road size limitations, marina facilities and capacity studies. The 2002 Visitor Use Study established a capacity of 106 houseboats, in part based on current size limits. Increasing the maximum size of houseboats may have an impact on the overall capacity and range of recreation opportunities and visitor experiences on the lake. The preferred alternative seeks to maintain or enhance the existing capacity and range of recreation opportunities provided.

Mrs. Melissa Vignau

O-10-1: Comment noted. The current size limitation of 15’ x 65’ is based on many factors, including but not limited to entrance road size limitations, marina facilities and capacity studies. The 2002 Visitor Use Study established a capacity of 106 houseboats, in part based on current size limits. Increasing the maximum size of houseboats may have an impact on the overall capacity and range of recreation opportunities and visitor experiences on the lake. The preferred alternative seeks to maintain or enhance the existing capacity and range of recreation opportunities provided.

O-10: Letter O-10

Water Resorts Inc.
New Melones Lake Marina
1110 W. Kertleman Lane, #20B, Lodi, CA 95240
phone: 209.333.8500
fax: 209.333.1753

January 4, 2010

Dear Mrs. Vignau,

We operate the concession for New Melones Lake Marina and were recently made aware of the production of the New Melones Lake Area Draft Resource Management Plan & Environmental Impact Statement and its impending comment period deadline. We look forward to working with the BOR on the more specific plan for the concession at the resort, and at that time we will have input as to the operations on the lake.

So at this time, we would like comment that the BOR review and amend its limit as to the number of houseboats allowed on the lake as well as their size. There is demand for more houseboat and outdoor enthusiasts to enjoy the lake and bring their vessels to the lake 15’ x 65’ were allowed to expand large vessel storage opportunities. Nearby Lakes McClure and Don Pedro both accommodate nearly twice the number of houseboats but are smaller reservoirs.

In addition, there is demand by the public for larger vessels than the current 15’ x 65’ size limitation. Many houseboats are safely built to 16’ x 70’ and are popular on several lakes, not only in California but throughout the U.S. (including BOR operated Lake Berryessa).

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Resource Management Plan for New Melones Lake.

Sincerely,

David M. Smith
President, Water Resorts Inc.
Shasta Lake Resorts, LP
New Melones Lake Marina
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Letter O-11

Comment Sheet for the New Melones Draft RMP/EIS

Comment here: December 20, 2009

Name: WALTER F. WESTER
Organization and Address: AOPA, SEAPLANE PILOTS ASSOC., ERA
Address: 722 BOARDWALK ONE, LARKSPUR, CA 94939
Phone: (415) 427-244

O-11-1: Comment noted. Management actions within the RMP must be consistent with Reclamation's goals and objectives. Reclamation must consider resource use, resource protection, and public safety in managing the New Melones Lake Area. Reclamation's preferred alternative would continue to implement the current policy for non-commercial seaplane use of New Melones Lake.

O-11-2: Comment noted. Operation of a seaplane school is included under Alternative B (Action R 31B).
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Letter O-12

O-12-1: Comment noted. Management actions within the RMP must be consistent with Reclamation's goals and objectives. Reclamation must consider resource use, resource protection, and public safety in managing the New Melones Lake Area. Reclamation's preferred alternative would continue to implement the current policy for non-commercial seaplane use of New Melones Lake.

O-12-2: Comment noted. Operation of a seaplane school is included under Alternative B (Action R 31B).
INDIVIDUALS COMMENTS
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Letter I-1

RECLAMATION
Managing Water in the West

Comment Sheet for the New Melones Draft RMP/EIS

Written comments may be submitted at the Comment Table or are due to the Bureau of Reclamation by close of business Monday, January 4, 2010. Comments may also be mailed to the address on the back, or faxed to 916-989-7109, or e-mailed to mbrockman@usbr.gov. Thank you.

(Please print clearly)

Name:  Paul Beluee  
Organization and Address:  Box 1624  
Twain Harte, CA 95383  
Phone (209) 770-1955 FAX ( )  
E-mail: paulbeluee@gmail.com

Comment here:  12-2-09

Date

I SUPPORT THE MULTIPLE USE ALTERNATIVE FOR MANY REASONS. BEING A LIFE LONG RESIDENT OF TUOLUMNE COUNTY, THIS ALTERNATIVE SEEMS TO BEST PROTECT THE LAKE'S NATURAL INTERESTS ENOUGH AND FACILITATES MORE RECREATION. WE ARE HOPING TO PROPOSE AN 18 HOLE DISC GOLF COURSE WHICH GOES ALONG PERFECTLY WITH THE MULTIPLE USE ALTERNATIVE.

I-1-1: Comment noted. Reclamation is developing a Commercial Services Plan for New Melones which will assess the feasibility of additional recreation facilities.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment to Letter I-1. Not a comment letter on the New Melones Lake Area Draft RMP/EIS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Letter I-1, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Info.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑ Camping Nearby ☑ Pay to play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description: On Army Corp of Engineers property. Fun layout with awesome views of reservoir. Huge campground, fishing, boating, etc. #17 is 700' downhill to lake's edge.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pros: Well designed course. No crowd whatsoever. We were the only golfers on a Saturday afternoon! 17 is epic. Other than the valley heat, a great afternoon of disc golfing. Camping on the lake. Would be a great winter course. Picnic area on hole 7/8 is awesome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pros: Amazing use of the land with near optimal flow starting and finishing at the same spot and no long walks to the next tee. Beautiful scenery with wild life and great views. Signage was great, even indicating a notch in a rock formation to show where the pin would be located. 18 very diverse holes with no issue of being repetitive, every hole is different from the last. Very obvious paths lead from pin to next tee which is also indicated on the tee sign at the start of the hole. Satellite course map provided at 1st tee which is located right next to the huge parks sign at the end of the parking lot. Tall grass off the beaten path will promote an accurate tee shot adding some difficulty. Picnic tables, running water, on-site bathrooms, and tons of parking. Never an issue of being overcrowded here.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pros: Very nice course with a great view of the lake. When I played it was just a 9 hole course. I did enjoy the time I spent there. Also has a camp site just across the lake</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pros: Bathrooms, Water, Tables, Garbage can, camping, boating. Satellite map of the course. Good mix of challenging and straight throws. A couple holes are blind but most have a rock or tree screen that if you throw your pathway you're golden. The rock rings are scary at first but once you get there the rocks are only waste high so you throw for bird or par no prob. The are 2x par four and 1x par five. The par five hole 17 is over 700ft. Wow down hill to the lake. At par five it's forgiving enough for newbies and old hand can throw birds.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Letter I-2

I-2-1: Comment noted.

I-2-2: Comment noted. Reclamation is developing a Commercial Services Plan for New Melones which will assess the feasibility of additional recreation facilities.
Letter I-2, Continued  | Comments  | Responses
---|---|---
| | Attachment to Letter I-2. Not a comment letter on the New Melones Lake Area Draft RMP/EIS.
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### Letter I-2, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letter I-2, Continued</td>
<td>Attachment to Letter I-2. Not a comment letter on the New Melones Lake Area Draft RMP/EIS.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

February 2010

New Melones Lake Area Final RMP/EIS

Reclamation
Letter I-2, Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment to Letter I-2. Not a comment letter on the New Melones Lake Area Draft RMP/EIS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Letter 12, Continued

Comments

New Melones Lake Area Final RMP/EIS

March 1, 2010

Mr. John Doe

Reclamation

Dear Mr. Doe:

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the New Melones Lake Area Draft RMP/EIS. I encourage the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation to carefully review and address these concerns.

1. The environmental impact assessment lacks sufficient detail on the potential effects of the proposed project.

2. The social and economic impacts are not sufficiently addressed.

3. The public review process could be improved.

I urge Reclamation to take these concerns into account in the finalization of the RMP/EIS.

Sincerely,

[Name]

Attachment to Letter 12. Not a comment letter on the New Melones Lake Area Draft RMP/EIS.
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February 2010

New Melones Lake Area Final RMP/EIS
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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Letter I-3

Comments

RECLAMATION
Managing Water in the West

Comment Sheet for the New Melones Draft RMP/EIS

Written comments may be submitted at the Comment Table or are due to the Bureau of Reclamation by close of business Monday, January 4, 2010. Comments may also be mailed to the address on the back, or faxed to 916-989-7109, or e-mailed to mbrockman@usbr.gov. Thank you.

(Please print clearly)

Name
Organization and Address
Phone (area code __________ FAX ( )__________ E-mail __________

Comment here: ____________________ Date ____________________

I-3-1
Provide access for firefighting water.

I-3-2
Allow a silt fence to be installed.

All comments become part of the public record.

Responses

I-3-1: Reclamation will comply with all ADA requirements, as stated under Actions R 50 through R 53.

I-3-2: There are no homes on Reclamation property. Reclamation does not have control over development on non-Reclamation lands.
I-4-1: Comment noted.
**Letter I-5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 2, 2009</td>
<td>I-5-1: Through the preferred alternative, Reclamation aims to achieve a balance between public use and conservation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Reclamation</td>
<td>I-5-2: This option is being considered under the preferred alternative (TA 4D), and will be implemented only if financially feasible and if the roadway could be rebuilt to meet modern boat ramp standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention: Melissa Brockman-Vignau, Project Manager</td>
<td>I-5-3: Reopening Parrotts Ferry Road is being considered under the preferred alternative (TA 4D).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7794 Folsom Dam Road</td>
<td>I-5-4: Reclamation would only undertake developments that would be adequately funded. Where Reclamation cannot afford new developments, it can enter into an agreement with a cost sharing partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folsom, CA 95630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject: New Melones Lake—Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melissa Brockman-Vignau:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the past 20 years our family has enjoyed New Melones Lake. Our favorite activity is fishing for both bass and trout. But we also use the lake for water skiing, walking and even birthday parties. We visit the lake about 30 times during the year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One of the very nice features of this lake is that it is not overly developed and is large enough to accommodate a lot of visitors. We also find those using it to be very considerate with little or no trash being discarded. It is definitely getting a lot more use over the years since we started going to it, but it is still a great lake as it exists now.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would hope any new management plan would recognize that it should be kept as Open for use as it is currently. I am always afraid of “New” management plans which end up closing lands or lakes to the public, or limiting their current use, for the sake of preservation. In the name of “Conservation” or protection of natural and cultural resources, too little consideration is given to those who enjoy and use facilities on a routine bases, instead, too much weight is often given to those who want to make things the way they believe things should be, i.e., no man input what-so-ever. This lake exists, let’s make good use of it while also protecting it for future users.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-1 My recommendations would also be to reopen access to boaters who may want to use the old Highway 49 road to launch their boats, i.e., very near the 49 bridge crossing and entrance to the New Melones Visitors center. We have used this location is the past until it was closed, and found that it was faster and saved fuel if we go up north, to gain access nearer the Stanislaus River input. It would seem to be a simple thing for the Bureau to monitor if this is a concern since it is so close to the local headquarters.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-2 We also used to enjoy going via Columbia and putting our float tubes and fishing via the Parrots Ferry Road and would like to see this re-opened. I believe the reason for closure of this access was due to garbage and old appliances being discarded. It would seem that with night time closure of the short road this problem could be easily remedied. Opening this would again provide access to those who may not want to be in the higher impacted areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-5-3 I am all in favor of bike and horse trails where vehicle traffic is not of a major concern. My reservation about these and other possible improvements is that the costs of maintaining them becomes too great and the whole use of the lake is closed in the future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I-5-4: Reclamation would only undertake developments that would be adequately funded. Where Reclamation cannot afford new developments, it can enter into an agreement with a cost sharing partner.

Letter I-5, Continued

I-5-4: at times because of underfunded budgets. I would rather see the lake kept at its present level of use and maintenance costs, rather than to expand possible features and uses only to have it not properly funded and have to be closed at times.

Thank you for allowing input.

David and Dawn Sweitzer
21174 Oneto Ridge
Sonora, CA. 95370
Dear Ms. Brockman,

My husband and I keep a sailboat at the New Melones Marina. We enjoy the uncluttered shoreline and the abundant wildlife that we see while out on the lake. The lake at this point is home to grebes of several varieties, at least two varieties of ducks, terns, seagulls, great blue herons, egrets, night herons etc., along with, of course, the osprey, many types of hawks, song birds, turkeys as well as the mammals and other creatures that inhabit the shore and surrounding country. Our hope is that if you must further develop the area, you keep in mind that too much development that involves buildings, roads that allow more people into previously fairly inaccessible areas, and the like will affect the wildlife and perhaps lower its numbers and ruin the pastoral feeling at the lake. The public can go to other lakes and waterways closer to more urban areas if they want overly developed recreation with lots of amenities.

We are not in favor of a recreational vehicle park that will involve more paved areas and lights, especially if any off-road vehicles are allowed.

What would the "floating campsites" that were mentioned in the report be like and where would they be located?

We are not in favor of floating campsites farther up river or movable campsites as this might be damaging to the wildlife and perhaps becoming a nuisance.

More people having more access will mean more garbage, litter, sewage etc. In the current situation with the economy which doesn't look like it will be rebounding any time soon, how will all these matters be handled when there isn't the money to pay for all the necessary extra employees and infrastructure. If fees are to be generated to pay for these things, how can you be sure those of us using the area will have the extra income to pay the new fees with many of us losing jobs or taking pay cuts?

Also, please include ways to avoid light pollution when making any new developments. One of the wonderful things about camping or being on the water at night is the fairly "clean" night sky. Since started keeping our boat in the marina 14 years ago there is more light pollution from nearby areas that have grown up in the past few years, so adding more lights near the lake would not help in keeping the night sky dark there.

Personally, it seems that for the coming decade, just keeping the systems that are already in place running smoothly will be a big job in itself considering the bad economy. Keeping the main thrust of the program on maintenance of existing developments, conservation of the area and low impact recreation, i.e. camping, fishing, hiking and boating seems to us the most prudent course of action.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice our concerns.

Ann & Mel Wallace