

I-53 *Rafferty, Lori*

To: jcollins@mp.usbr.gov
Subject: Lake Cachuma

Hi Jack!
BLM re: Lake Cachuma, California- future recreation

As a long-time resident of Santa Barbara, California and being of a recreating family, I want to add my 2 cents regarding future plans for Lake Cachuma. This lake is vastly underused for water sports and it's a shame that people can't physically get in the water. It also has great potential to establish a nice network of trails around the lake. It desperately needs:

I-53-1

- a dedicated area of the lake set aside for launching windsurfers and kayaks which would stay within a large roped off area (currently there is already the perfect place for that at the eastern area of public access/camping)
- another dedicated area of the lake for swimmers, again roped off and designated as such. there is a nice cove to the west of the main entrance.
- well maintained hiker/mountain biker/horse back rider trails completely all the way around the lake and camping facilities for those user groups, like group areas and day use areas. I am a VWR (volunteer wilderness ranger) with the Forest Service and am familiar with this area. As our population density increases, the public needs more options for recreating because if they don't have the opportunities to enjoy open spaces in nature, they will not care about it to save it. Lake Cachuma is perfect for some simple expansions to increase recreating options. Lets GO FOR IT!

Let me know if you need people on any committees for exploring these ideas here in Santa Barbara.
thanks,
Lori Rafferty

Response to Comment I-53

I-53-1

The commenter's suggestions are noted. See the responses to Comments I-1-1, I-4-1, and I-7-1 in regard to kayaking, the trail network, and swimming. Windsurfing is not included under the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2).

I-54 *Roger, Nathan*

To: jcollins@mp.usbr.gov
Subject: Cachuma Lake DRMP/EIS Comments

I-54-1

Dear Mr. Collins,

As an avid hiker and Red Rock Recreation Area user, as well as backpacker and kayaker, I am in favor of greatly expanded access to Lake Cachuma. Personally I believe that Alternative 3 only begins to scratch the surface of what could be allowed in the reservoir and I greatly favor increased north shore use. It seems ludicrous to me that while just upstream body contact with the Santa Ynez river is practically encouraged, it is prohibited in Lake Cachuma.

Also I would encourage the acceptance of open-hulled kayaks providing greater access to ocean kayakers.

Thanks for your time.
Take care,
Nathan "Fuzzy" Rogers

Response to Comment I-54

I-54-1

Alternative 2—Enhanced Recreation—has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would allow for low-impact recreation on the North Shore, as described in Section 2.7.2 and summarized in Table 2-3 (under “North Shore Recreation”) of the RMP/EIS. See the responses to Comments I-7-1 and I-1-1 in regard to swimming and kayaking, respectively.

I-55 *Rose, Barbara J.*

To: <jcollins@mp.usbr.gov>
Subject: Lake Cachuma

Dear Mr. Collins:

Regarding future usage of Lake Cachuma in Santa Barbara County, California I would appreciate your considering my input, as a taxpayer and resident of Santa Barbara County.

I-55-1

Lake Cachuma is a lovely place, but I have often thought it is a shame that canoeing and kayaking is not allowed on the lake. The lake is quite peaceful and small and sheltered enough to make capsizing a canoe or kayak unlikely. Even if swimming or water contact is not allowed in the future, I think it would be wonderful to be able to take a kayak out on Lake Cachuma. Water contact would be very unlikely because the waters are generally extremely calm. Lake Casitas in nearby Ventura County is also a water resevoir and canoeing and kayaking are allowed there. Why not Lake Cachuma? I believe that with all the treatment of water in our modern age, denying possible water contact and even swimming is probably unnecessary.

I also would be in favor of allowing people to swim in the lake in a beach area. You are aware, I'm sure, that temperatures on the lake in the summer are frequently above 90 degrees F. In Central California, there are very few places where a person can swim in a lake. Swimming in the ocean is very cold, especially for young children, and somewhat treacherous. One of my best memories of growing up in Illinois is going swimming in a lake in the summertime. I missed having that when my kids grew up in California, but would sure love to see it available for my grandchildren. I think that water skiing on the lake would hurt its peaceful nature.

Thanks for listening.

Yours truly,
Barbara J. Rose

Response to Comment I-55

I-55-1

See the responses to Comments I-1-1 and I-7-1 in regard to kayaking/canoeing and swimming, respectively.

I-56 *Rudd, Deah*

message from Deah Rudd <drudd@usbr.gov> on 11, 10 Sep 2008 10:11:47 -0700
To: <jcollins@mp.usbr.gov>
Subject: Lake Cachuma

I-56-1 [I would like the horseback riding trails to remain and be increased around Lake Cachuma.

Thank You.
Deah Rudd

Response to Comment I-56

I-56-1

See the response to Comment I-4-1.

I-57 *Schaefer, Julie*

Subject Fwd: Rowing on Lake Cachuma: Lake Resource Management Plan
>>> Julie Schaefer <julie2row@hotmail.com> 10/07/08 2:43 PM >>>

I-57-1 Dear Mr. Epperson,
[I am a master rower who has always wished I could bring my single scull to Lake Cachuma and row there. My husband and I have owned property at the Hollister Ranch for over 30 years and have been coming up to camp there regularly during that time. We are now getting ready to start the process of building our retirement home at the ranch and so I was overjoyed to learn the Resource Management Plan is giving consideration to increasing non power boating activities at Lake Cachuma. One of the great things about rowing as a recreational activity and competitive sport is the fact that it does not create any type of water pollution. There are no motors and no human contact with the water (other than stepping in and out of the boat!) In addition to personal enjoyment, I believe there is a great opportunity to develop a masters' rowing program on Lake Cachuma which would be of great benefit to the community as a whole. Rowing is a fantastic sport for all ages. I have been rowing in San Diego for over 18 years and our rowing club competes at all major rowing regattas. Additionally, we have a strong Junior Rowing Program which helps to prepare high school rowers for competitive college rowing. Obviously there are a great many benefits for any community with a possible rowing venue. Please, please do whatever you can to make rowing at Lake Cachuma a reality. Thank you so much for your support and consideration.
Julie Schaefer

Response to Comment I-57

I-57-1

See the response to Comment I-1-1.

I-58 *Simek, Mary*

To: jcollins@mp.usbr.gov
Subject: Lake Cachuma

Hello,

I-58-1

I just read about the plans to possibly change current rules at Lake Cachuma to allow kayaks, etc. I live in Orange County, CA and have not visited Lake Cachuma for the past 6 years because of the high rental boat prices and the fact that I could not use my sit-on-top kayak. I have since sold the kayak and am now looking at buying an inflatable boat. I love to fish Cachuma. Hopefully, things will change so it's not so restrictive. I wonder how many other anglers do not fish at Cachuma for the same reasons? It's next to impossible to fish from shore.

Sincerely,
Mary Simek

Response to Comment I-58

I-58-1

The comment is noted. Kayaking and canoeing would be allowed under the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2), as described in Section 2.7.2. Kayaks and canoes would be subject to any vessel inspection protocols that are in place (see Section 3.9.2.2).

I-59 *Singley, Loretta*

To: <jcollins@mp.usbr.gov>
Subject: Lake Cachuma, Santa Barbara County, California

Dear Sir/Madam,

I-59-1

I would like you to know that I enjoy riding my horses at Lake Cachuma very much. I would like to see the trails kept open for horseback riding in the future. I understand that our comments should be directed to you in order for you to know our concerns and to let you know how much we enjoy the trails at Lake Cachuma and we want to see them kept open.

Loretta Singley

Response to Comment I-59

I-59-1

See the response to Comment I-4-1.

I-60 *Smith, Penny*

To: jcollins@mp.usbr.gov
Subject: Equestrian trails at Lake Cachuma

I-60-1 Hello,
[Just wanted to let you know there are lots of equestrian riders that enjoy riding Lake Cachuma. We would like to keep the trails we have and increase them.
Thanks,
Penny Smith

Response to Comment I-60

I-60-1

See the response to Comment I-4-1.

I-61 *St. Lawrence, Amber*

To: jcollins@mp.usbr.gov
Subject: Activities at Cachuma Lake

I-61-1 Dear J. Collins:
[It was brought to my attention that the activities available at Cachuma Lake are being considered for the next 25 years or so. I would like to offer my request that more boating, jet ski's and recreational activities be available. My family travels to Lake Lopez or San Antonio in order to jet ski. We would much rather keep our camping and jet skiing here in our County. We would do more of these things if we could stay local. I would also like to see the monies spent at these other lakes be spent here in our own county. I am a big believer in supporting our local communities.
Thank you,
Amber St. Lawrence
Buellton, CA

Response to Comment I-61

I-61-1

The commenter's support for increased boating, jet skis, and other recreational activities is noted. See the responses to Comments I-7-1 and I-1-1 in regard to body contact recreation and kayaking/canoeing, respectively.

I-62 *Stanton, Frank D.*

To: <jcollins@mp.usbr.gov>
Subject: Lake Cachuma

I-62-1

I have been a camper/fisherman at Lake Cachuma for the past 38 years and have enjoyed the peaceful tranquility of the wildlife and uncrowded waters on the lake. Please, PLEASE, do NOT open these waters to human contact! I know a restricted swimming area and kayaking doesn't sound like much of an intrusion on the lake, but once the "door is opened" to this type of activity it's just a matter of time before the water skiers and jet boats take over. Please keep Lake Cachuma a pristine, fishing only lake.

Respectfully,
Frank D. Stanton, DVM
Santa Maria, CA

Response to Comment I-62

I-62-1

Body contact would not be allowed under the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2).

I-63 *Stetson, James*

To: jcollins@mp.usbr.gov
Subject: Land use at lake Cachuma

I-63-1

Mr. Collins

Just a quick note to let you know of my interest in additional trails at Lake Cachuma for horseback enthusiasts. I am one of many who enjoy horseback riding on the weekend. I and others I know are constantly looking for new places to ride. Thank you for your attention in this matter.

J Stetson

Response to Comment I-63

I-63-1

See the response to Comment I-4-1.

I-64 *Stetz, Joe and Claudia*

To: <jcollins@mp.usbr.gov>
Subject: Lake Cachuma

I-64-1 [Cachuma should be a place for recreation as is so many other lakes. Jet skis / swimming should be allowed. Lake Lopez is a prime example of the success. Designate areas for PWC and swimming.

Response to Comment I-64

I-64-1

See the response to Comment I-7-1.

I-65 Taylor, Gail

RECEIVED
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
SCCAO
FRESNO CA



Sept. 20, 2008

2008 SEP 25 AM 10:57
Dear Jack Collins,

I've no E-mail so
must write you. I've just
read the Lake Cachuma article.
Takes me time sometimes to read
all the paper. (News paper)

During the late 60's and
early 70's my family camped
a lot each summer at Lake
Cachuma. I do not believe
you can make the lake into
a swimming & canoe lake.
Maybe there are things to
clean up the mess people leave.
I see mess everywhere on my
walks around town. People are
not careful what they throw
away. I'd sure give it a

Cancer Information 1.800.ACS.2345 www.cancer.org

It's about being a community that takes up the fight.

No. 7523.05

lot more thought and
looking into for the
water to be clean for
people to drink and use.
modern technology sometime
works. let them go to the
Ocean or Public swimming
Places.

as a family we enjoyed
camping and found plenty
to do.

Very Sincerely

Mrs. J. T. Taylor

I-65-1

Body contact would not be allowed under the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2). Kayaking and canoeing would be permitted, subject to the restrictions described in Section 2.7.2 of the RMP/EIS.

I-66 Tuttle, Susan

To: jcollins@mp.usbr.gov
Subject: Lake Cachuma

I-66-1 Jack Collins, Resource Specialist
I just wanted to drop a note in regards to the importance of maintaining and keeping horse trails in the Lake Cachuma area. As a Santa Barbara County resident I hope we keep and even expand on any horse trails. North Santa Barbara County has very little horse trail areas.
Thank you for your attention,

Susan Tuttle

Response to Comment I-66

I-66-1

See the response to Comment I-4-1.

I-67 Unetic, Andrew

To: jcollins@mp.usbr.gov
Subject: lake cachuma

I-67-1 Dear Mr. Collins, I understand you are an appropriate person to receive input about plans for Lake Cachuma. I attended UCSB many years ago and I have been an active kayaker for about 15 years. I used to drive by the lake often on trips from Northern to Southern California and I looked forward to the day I could find time to camp at Lake Cachuma and bring our kayaks. I was flabbergasted when we arrived with our kayaks on the roof and were told we couldn't use them. When I was give the explanation as to why they were prohibited it didn't seem reasonable. Many lakes in California which are also considered resevoirs do allow kayaking. It is hard for me to understand why our kayaks are more offensive than the fishing boats using petroleum based fuels are allowed and we are not. It seems to have something to do with the fear that our bodies will enter the water? This is not the habit of the people I paddle with. Are you folks afraid we will defecate in the lake or urinate in the lake? This kind of behavior if it were to occur would be just as likely from people on fishing boats? Anyway, Cachuma is a beautiful lake and I hope it will be opened up to more low-impact recreational uses.
Thank You.

Andrew Unetic
San Luis Obispo

Response to Comment I-67

I-67-1

See the response to Comment I-1-1.

I-68 Weir, Wanda

Oct 29 08 02:54p

UPS Store 1882

8056887018

p.2

I-103

CACHUMA LAKE RMP and EIS

MY NAME IS Wanda Weir

I LIVE IN Santa Ynez NEIGHBORHOOD IN [COUNTY].

Santa Barbara County
QUESTIONS/COMMENTS ON THE CACHUMA LAKE RMP and EIS

I-68-1

Water is a life necessity more precious than oil.
Protecting our fresh water supply must become
our number one national priority as well as
that of the state of California. We all know
the planet's potable water is limited; therefore,
should not be looked upon as purely a recreational
resource. After all the nearby Pacific Ocean
offers much in the way of sun and fun on
its beaches, boating, fishing and swimming
opportunities, etc. Having been raised in the
Mid West, I hope to never see Cachuma suffer.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS MUST BE RECEIVED by the Bureau of (over)
Reclamation **no later than close of business Monday, September**
~~22, 2008~~ Oct 31, 2008

Send your comments (delivery receipt and signature requested) to:

Mr. Bob Epperson, Project Manager
Bureau of Reclamation
1243 'N' Street, Fresno, CA 93721

OR - Email your comments (delivery receipt option selected) to:

repperson@mp.usbr.gov

Oct 29 08 02:54p

UPS Store 1882

8056887018

p.3

I-68-1
Cont.

The same fate as the Five Great Lakes.

Concerns

- The current economy is not conducive to expansion. Let future generations decide.
- This bureau admits to unresolved issues with poachers, waste management, minimal staffing, funding limitations, and we in the local community are keenly aware of entrenched outlaws growing illegal crops with our national parks—including areas around Cachuma Lake. How will this be better managed by expansion?
- Our roadways are killways for wildlife. More traffic/more inroads/more loss of wildlife, not to mention the closure of access to water and wildlife corridors that human encroachment entails.

I-68-2

Minimal impact? What is that? San Marcos Pass is already wobbling under high speed traffic offenders, trash and litter along the highway in what was once a pristine, natural, quiet road adventure through a gorgeous mountain pass where one could view herds of deer in the meadows and even a coyote off to the side once in awhile.

1-103-5 [• Please don't urbanize the country!

My choice would be ALTERNATIVE PLAN I

Responses to Comment I-68

I-68-1

The commenter's concerns about water quality are noted. Reclamation considers the Preferred Alternative to be protective of water quality and compatible with the objective to operate Cachuma Lake for water quality and water supply.

I-68-2

Alternative 2, not Alternative 3, has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative would not substantially increase recreation over Alternative 1 levels. As stated in Section 2.4.2.1, new or modified recreational uses would be considered based on (1) sufficient public demand, (2) sufficient staffing and funding to manage the new or modified uses in accordance with the RMP, and (3) potential for increased public benefits and use.

I-69 Whelan, Dennis

To: jcollins@mp.usbr.gov
Subject: Fwd: Cachuma RMP DRAFT

Mr. Jack Collins

Thank you for the opportunity to comment upon the Cachuma Lake RMP alternatives. My comments are based upon the primary issue areas addressed in the RMP Facility Management and Recreation:

- Encourage an appropriate range of recreational uses.
- Protect public health and safety.

I first experienced Cachuma Lake as a member of the UCSB Rowing Club in 1977. I am a national and international Masters Rowing champion, and consider Cachuma to be my primary training venue for the better part of the last 20 years. My comments stem from my extensive use of the facility over hundreds if not thousands of hours experience on the lake.

I-69-1

I question the Water Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (WROS) establishment of different speed limits for the lake: one in the "main body of the lake" and another for the rest of the facility. There is no definition of the "main body" other than a small scale graphic illustration. There are no buoys or other indicators on the lake defining this area in situ. Further complicating this, the level of the lake is constantly fluctuating, making the majority of the lake this higher speed limit when the lake level is low. I stress adoption of one 25MPH lake speed limit, for as proposed under Alternative 2 - 2.6.3 Lake Recreation, the total number of boats allowed in the lake at one time would range from 40 (minimum pool) to 120 (maximum pool). Certainly having one lower speed limit is more consistent with the planning principles to encourage non-motorized recreational uses of the lake and protect public health and safety. Additionally, as kayaking and canoeing and rowing would be modified during peak boating periods associated with trout fishing tournaments, there should be equivalent non-power boat times/days events as Cachuma is uniquely distinguished by its quiet lake experience most visitors are seeking, one that is more natural experience than at other lakes in the region where more active recreation is allowed.

I-69-2

Finally, under Section 2.5.2 Lake Recreation: "UCSB crew facilities may be relocated at the option of the local managing partner to accommodate camping/boat launch facilities." It should be made clear in the RMP that any and all costs associated with the relocation of UCSB facilities that were funded and constructed by UCSB shall be for equivalent facilities and paid for by the local managing agency and not by UCSB. This is only fair.

I-69-3

In general I am in favor of enhancing and expanding non-motorized recreational uses of the lake in all the alternatives. To that end, do not allow access to the entire lake for fishing, especially the eastern end, nor increase access for fisherman using East End of the Lakes' shallow waters. Finally, the Boating Management Plan limits size of the boat and type of engine, and should limit the size of engine as well.

Thank you for your consideration.

Responses to Comment I-69

I-69-1

See the response to Comment I-9-1.

I-69-2

The RMP/EIS is an environmental document that does not address economic issues related to the potential costs associated with the relocation of the rowing facilities. This issue would be negotiated with the local managing partner if/when the need arises.

I-69-3

The comments about designating times for nonpowered boats, restricting fishing in some areas of the lake, and the Boating Management Plan are noted.

I-70 Woods, Shelley R.

To: <jcollins@mp.usbr.gov>
Subject: cachuma lake

I-70-1

Please, Please leave Cachuma Lake the same as it is. It is so peaceful and quiet. It will ruin all of the charm if jet skis and wake boarders are allowed. There are plenty of lakes for that. We fish there almost every weekend and absolutely love this lake. There are no problems ever and if all those activities are allowed it will cause much contention!
Thanks for listening.

Response to Comment I-70

I-70-1

The comment is noted. No personal watercraft, waterskiing, or wake boarding will be allowed under the Preferred Alternative.

I-71 Youngson, Jim

To: <jcollins@mp.usbr.gov>

Subject: Lake Cachuma Draft Resource Management Plan - public comment

I-71-1

As a longtime user of Cachuma Lake I urge the Bureau of Reclamation to open up the lake to kayaks and additional hiking trails in the future. Passive recreation such as a trail around limited parts of the north side of the lake would be a wonderful outdoor opportunity for many families – same goes for the island at eastern end. Canoes, kayaks etc should be allowed on the lake, as the users don't really come into contact with the water; certainly you have allowed the UCSB crew team to practice there so there is precedent. However, I do not wish to see waterskiing or other intensive, motorized water sports on Lake Cachuma.

Thank you,
Jim Youngson,

Response to Comment I-71

I-71-1

Kayaking and canoeing would be allowed under the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2), as described in Section 2.7.2. Kayaks and canoes would be subject to any vessel inspection protocols that are in place (see Section 3.9.2.2).

On the North Shore, the Preferred Alternative would allow low-impact, limited day use; equestrian use, hiking, and biking on primitive trails with a permit or guide, and in accordance with restrictions. The Preferred Alternative would also allow full day use on Arrowhead Island, including public access for hiking on primitive and/or well developed trails; picnicking; bird watching; group events; shoreline access; shoreline and dock fishing, in accordance with restrictions.

No personal watercraft, waterskiing, or wake boarding will be allowed under the Preferred Alternative.

B.7 COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC HEARINGS

B.7.1 August 26, 2008, Solvang, CA

Bruce Wales (Santa Ynez River Water Conservation District)

Comment: This document is out of date. The impact assessment may have been done in the last six months, but the alternatives are over six years old. There hasn't been any public input or participation since early 2002.

Response to Comment: The Final RMP/EIS has been updated to include additional data pertinent to the evaluation for biological resources, water quality, air quality, greenhouse gases and climate change, and other resources. The additional data do not change the conclusions of the EIS and have been used to address the No Action and action alternatives.

As stated in Section 2.2, the RMP alternatives were developed in accordance with the planning process steps outlined in Reclamation's Resource Management Plan Guidebook and with NEPA requirements. Section 2.2.4 describes the public participation in the development of RMP alternatives, including public meetings held in December 2003. The Administrative Draft RMP/EIS was provided to the Cachuma Operation and Maintenance Board (Kate Rees, General Manager), and Reclamation received and incorporated the comments in April 2006.

Regardless of the alternative selected, the RMP can be amended at any time to reflect changed environmental conditions; unforeseen events; changes in policies and land use plans that have been determined to be infeasible, impractical, or have undesirable consequences; and change in applicable laws and regulations (Section 2.4.2).

Chip Wullbrandt (Montecito Water District and Goleta Water District)

Comment: I participated in the preparation and the review of the EIS as an independent contractor in the 1990s, and the analysis was on impacts of continued operation of the project on resources. It seems that this document looks at a balance between enhanced recreational uses and natural resources. That seems inappropriate. The EIS should look at the impacts on resources, particularly water supply and water quality. I was surprised that there was not an alternative that is less intrusive than the proposed action alternatives. I encourage less use than what is currently being considered to protect the water quality and water supply.

Response to Comment: The issue of the RMP's impacts on water quality is addressed in the Response to Comment R-1-11. Reclamation considers the Preferred Alternative to be protective of water quality and compatible with the objective to operate Cachuma Lake for water quality and water supply. The Final EIS has been revised to include new Section 2.9, which discusses the reasons that an alternative that would reduce recreational opportunities in the Plan Area was eliminated from detailed study.

Ralph Fertig (Santa Barbara Bicycle Coalition)

Comment: Where will the funding come from? Will the selected alternative be self-sustaining in the future?

Response to Comment: Facilities and improvements proposed in the RMP would only be implemented if demand warranted and if funding was available. The responsibility for funding, designing, and implementing (or constructing) the management actions and improvement projects will be specified in an agreement with the local managing partner. The source of funding will depend on many factors that will vary over the planning period, such as use fees, availability of grants, etc.

Ernie Del Rio (Central Coast Cabins)

Comment: Who will implement the alternative that is selected? Have concessionaires been selected?

Response to Comment: A local managing partner would implement management actions allowed as part of the Preferred Alternative according to the direction provided in the RMP (see Sections 2.2 and 2.4.2). Concessionaires would be selected after Reclamation issues a Record of Decision on the Final RMP/EIS and develops a management agreement with a local managing partner.

Richard Crutchfield (UCSB Rowing Team)

Comment: The County has done a tremendous job as a manager at Cachuma Lake. The County did a terrific job of coming up with guidelines that are now sort of a model for other lakes in the area for how to deal with the threat of quagga mussels.

It's possible that increased passive use, such as kayaks and canoes, would be a good thing. I know that they have done that successfully at Lake Casitas.

Cachuma Lake is worth protecting, not only for the water resource, but for the beauty of the area and the nature that exists there.

Response to Comment: Reclamation notes the comments. Santa Barbara County has more than 50 years of experience in managing recreation at Cachuma Lake and manages operation of other county parks.

Kayaks and canoes are allowed under the Preferred Alternative, as described in Section 2.7.2. Reclamation considers the Preferred Alternative to be protective of water quality and the visual and natural resources of Cachuma Lake.

Neal Taylor

Comment: Although canoes and kayaks are allowed, there is no place for float tubing or float boating for fishing purposes. Other lakes similar to Cachuma Lake allow this. Lopez Lake in San Luis Obispo has the same restrictions as Cachuma Lake but still allows float tubing with chest waders and swim fins. Within restricted areas, it could be allowed in Cachuma Lake because of the growing population. I certainly see the need for fishing (with safety restrictions) in our local

area for bass, crappie, bluegill and trout. Life jackets should be worn and fishing should only be allowed within reasonable distances of shorelines or even only in particular coves.

Response to Comment: The canoes and kayaks that would be allowed under the Preferred Alternative (Alternative 2) provide a separation between the user and the waters of Cachuma Lake. With float tubing and float boating, the user's body would be in direct contact with the lake. As described in the response to Comment I-7-1, it was determined that allowing body contact would present conflicts with protection of water quality and water supply functions at Cachuma Lake.

Kate Rees (Cachuma Operation and Maintenance Board)

Comment: The comment period for comments on the Draft RMP/EIS should be extended by a minimum of 30 days.

Response to Comment: The public review period for the Draft RMP/EIS was originally from July 25, 2008, to September 23, 2008. Due to considerable public interest in the RMP, Reclamation extended the comment period through October 31, 2008, for a total review period of 99 days. Notice of the extension was issued by postcard to the project mailing list, by press release on September 11, 2008, and by notice in the Federal Register on October 9, 2008 (73 Federal Register 197: 59669).

Rebecca Bjork (City of Santa Barbara Public Works Department)

Comment: Another meeting should be held in the Santa Barbara area (the South County area), where the people who predominantly use this water supply live.

Response to Comment: Reclamation held a second public meeting on the Draft RMP/EIS at the City Hall Council Chambers in Carpinteria on October 8, 2008. The Carpinteria Water District coordinated public notification of the meeting.

Wanda Weir

Comment: Body contact should not be made with the water for many reasons. The most important reason is that this is our drinking water and the source of water for Santa Barbara residents.

Too much recreation crowded around the lakefront shores could affect wildlife by reducing access to the areas that have historically been theirs, particularly water areas.

The peace and quiet of the valley is important. Cachuma Lake is not only a recreational place, it's also a healing place for many people. The peace and tranquility of the lake is just as important as providing an outlet for water sports. The Pacific Ocean is close by and available for some of the rougher types of water sports. I would like for the public to come and enjoy this as a place to relax rather than come to for socialization. This is a great place for artists and people who love nature. It's more difficult to relax with the noise of ski boats around.

Response to Comment: The commenter's concerns about water quality are noted. Body contact will not be allowed with the Preferred Alternative.

Alternative 2 has been identified as the Preferred Alternative but would not substantially increase recreation or visitation. The RMP includes measures to reduce or avoid impacts to vegetation, wildlife, fisheries, aquatic communities, and special-status species from any increase in recreation and visitation (Section 4.4.5).

The Preferred Alternative would not increase boat densities on the main body of the lake. As described in Section 4.7.5, the Preferred Alternative would not result in visual impacts on the north shore of Cachuma Lake, and would open new areas for viewing from nonmotorized boats by allowing for kayak use in Cachuma Bay and Santa Cruz Bay.

B.7.2 October 8, 2008, Carpinteria, CA

Alex Keuper (Carpinteria Valley Water District)

Comment: The RMP should consider an Alternative “Negative 1” that would include no boating, no swimming, and no grazing on the North Shore.

The RMP has a paucity of data regarding current use. Who wants expanded recreation and hiking on the North Shore? The RMP doesn’t identify who is asking for expanded recreation and facilities and how many requests have been received.

Response to Comment:

The Preferred Alternative would not allow body contact or change current grazing practices. Grazing would continue to supplement vegetation and fire management.

Section 2.9 has been added to the Final EIS to discuss the concept of reducing recreational opportunities in the Plan Area in order to protect water quality, water supply, and natural resources. Failure to consider opportunities for outdoor recreation would violate Reclamation’s Congressional mandate and therefore would not satisfy the purpose and need of the proposed action. Although the RMP does not include an alternative that specifically provides for less recreation than is currently allowed, the local managing partner would have flexibility in implementing management actions in the Plan Area. See the Responses to Comments R-2-14 and R-2-8 for additional information.

Current uses are summarized in Section 3.9.2. The Draft RMP/EIS considered the potential enhancement of recreation in response to numerous comments received during the public scoping period that requested additional recreational opportunities. The comments are summarized in EIS Table 2-1, detailed in EIS Section 3.9.3.1, and presented in the Public Scoping Report (URS 2006a), which is incorporated by reference into the EIS. Several comments on the Draft RMP/EIS from individuals requested body contact, trail enhancement, and other recreational opportunities (see Comments I-1-1 through I-71-1).

Douglas Morgan (Montecito Water District)

Comment: The benchmark for existing conditions in the RMP should be the start date of the previous contract signed in the mid-1950s. In addition, the RMP should include an analysis of how the County performed. Whether the contract should be open to other bidders was not considered at all. The RMP implies that the County has not maintained facilities or water quality. The County couldn’t even come up with \$200K for mussel prevention.

The RMP should include a detailed analysis of supply and demand. Why were only three “beneficial impacts” identified?

The No Action Alternative is already overdeveloped. The RMP doesn’t include costs of water treatment. The text refers to “disposal income,” which should read “disposable income.”

Response to Comment: An EIS should include a description of the affected environment that exists before the action (40 CFR 1502.10, 1502.15). The proposed action is implementation of the RMP, not the development of a management contract or identification of a local managing partner. Accordingly, an analysis of Santa Barbara County’s performance as the local managing partner does not relate to the proposed action (implementation of the RMP).

Reclamation disagrees with the statement that the RMP implies that Santa Barbara County has not maintained facilities or water quality.

Recreation supply and demand is addressed in Sections 3.9 and 4.9. The text of Section 3.9 has been revised to include updated information that became available after publication of the Draft RMP/EIS. The information does not change the conclusions of the Final RMP/EIS.

The statement that only three beneficial impacts are identified in the RMP/EIS appears to be based on Tables S-1 and 4-1, which summarize impacts of the proposed alternatives. The text of the RMP/EIS identifies several beneficial impacts for the Preferred Alternative, including:

- Reduction in fuel load and management of fire risk in the Plan Area through prescribed burns and update of the fire management plan
- Invasive weed control and use of native vegetation in restoration and landscape plantings as part of the vegetation management plan
- Increased public education about how to reduce their impacts on water quality and other natural resources
- Protection and enhancement of habitat from implementation of natural resource management measures (see Section 4.4.5.1) and a fisheries management plan
- Reduced pollution and disturbance to habitat for special-status species including bald eagles and peregrine falcons from restricting motorized boating in Cachuma Bay
- Increased access to local recreation and natural resource facilities for local and regional populations by opening Live Oak Camp to more public use

The No Action Alternative (Alternative 1) would not implement an RMP and would continue the current course and status of management actions. Section 2.9 discusses the reasons that an alternative that would reduce recreational opportunities in the Plan Area was eliminated from detailed study. As stated in Section 2.4.2, recreational uses or activities allowed under the RMP may also be discontinued in the future at the discretion of the local managing partner if demand decreases, the activity is not economically viable, new security or safety considerations arise, and/or unforeseen significant environmental impacts occur that cannot be mitigated.

The costs of water treatment are not included in the RMP/EIS because the RMP does not propose changes to water distribution or treatment facilities. If the issue is the cost of water treatment in relation to a mitigation action, see the response to Comment R-1-14.

The editorial error (“disposal income”) has been corrected in the Final RMP/EIS.

Thomas Mosby (Montecito Water District)

Comment: The RMP contains only a cursory discussion of water quality, doesn't discuss the first contract, and doesn't include alternatives that address impacts of current recreation. There was a lack of notice and lack of member unit participation in the RMP process. Scoping didn't consider current threats. The superior alternative would be to restrict activities that affect water quality. The new contract with the managing partner should only extend to 2015, when COMB pays off project.

We have an endangered water supply. Recreation is secondary to the purpose of water supply.

Response to Comment: Sections 3.1 and 4.1 of the Final RMP/EIS have been revised to provide additional detail about recent water quality data, including boat fuel discharges and water quality issues related to invasive mussels.

The details of the 1953 management agreement between Reclamation and Santa Barbara County, referenced in Section 1.1.3 of the Final RMP/EIS, are not described because the proposed action is implementation of the RMP, not the development of a management contract or identification of a local managing partner.

The impacts of current recreation are analyzed in Section 4 as part of the No Action Alternative. Section 2.9 has been added to the Final EIS to discuss the concept of reducing recreational opportunities in the Plan Area in order to protect water quality, water supply, and natural resources. As stated in Section 2.4.2, recreational uses or activities allowed under the RMP may be discontinued in the future at the discretion of the local managing partner if demand decreases, the activity is not economically viable, new security or safety considerations arise, and/or unforeseen significant environmental impacts occur that cannot be mitigated.

Section 2.2.4 describes the public participation in the development and review of the Draft RMP/EIS. The Member Units were included in the public meetings about development of the RMP alternatives, and the Administrative Draft RMP/EIS was provided to Cachuma Operation and Maintenance Board (Kate Rees, General Manager) for review. As described in Section 2.2.4.2, the public comment period was extended and a second public meeting was held to give the Member Units and general public the opportunity to provide input on the Draft RMP/EIS. Written comments from the Member Units and responses to their comments from Reclamation are included in Sections B.4 and B.5 of this appendix.

In regard to the comment that scoping for the RMP process did not consider current threats, see the response to Comment R-2-13.

The comments about the superior alternative, the term of the contract with the local managing partner, and water supply are noted.

Rebecca Bjork (City of Santa Barbara)

Comment: Also encourages less intensive use approach. Concerns about current uses not addressed.

Response to Comment: Alternative 2, the Preferred Alternative, would not substantially expand recreation. Implementation of any new activity or facility would only take place if demand warranted and if funding was available. As stated in Section 2.4.2, recreational uses or activities allowed under the RMP may be discontinued in the future at the discretion of the local

managing partner if demand decreases, the activity is not economically viable, new security or safety considerations arise, and/or unforeseen significant environmental impacts occur that cannot be mitigated.

Current uses are summarized in Section 3.9.2, and the impacts of continuing those uses (as part of the No Action Alternative) are analyzed in Section 4. Additional information about existing conditions and potential impacts has been added to the Final RMP/EIS in response to specific comments.



URS

1333 Broadway, Suite 800
Oakland, CA 94612
T: 510.893.3600
F: 510.874.3268