

Minutes  
Board of Directors Special Meeting Held  
January 25, 2007

A special meeting of the Board of Directors was held January 25, 2007 at Casitas' Office, Oak View, California. Directors Baggerly, Word, and Hicks were present. Directors Kaiser and Handley were absent. Also present were John Johnson, General Manager, and Rebekah Vieira, Clerk of the Board. Also in attendance were Bob Epperson, Jack Collins, Mike Delamore and Bob Wignot with the Bureau of Reclamation and Steve Kellogg and Sarah Labelle with URS. There were two staff members and two members of the public in attendance. President Baggerly called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

1. Public comments.

None

2. Board of Director comments.

None

3. Discussion of the Resource Management Plan for Lake Casitas

- a. Update on the timeframe and schedules.
- b. Discussion of the Alternatives including questions and corrections
- c. Discussion regarding CEQA issues

Steve Kellogg reported that based on the meeting today he hopes to leave here with as much agreement as we can get on the alternatives. He does not have a preferred alternative. Want to have a range of reasonable alternatives that we agree have the basics right for the existing situation at Casitas and are they reasonable. We will go back and complete an administrative draft to include the plan itself and EIR/EIS sections which would address the alternatives. The administrative draft will be completed by April and by the end of the year we will have the final draft. The first step is for the administrative draft to be reviewed and then public draft will be reviewed with a public hearing, comments, and response to comments. It will include a narrative which describes the alternatives. Then there will be an impact assessment for implementing the actions. President Baggerly asked if the consultant for WROS has completed the narrative. Mr. Epperson answered they have completed the draft and are in process of incorporating all the places they reviewed into one. URS has the information for Casitas.

President Baggerly asked about the open space lands are we to consider those or are you removing Casitas from operations and maintenance of open space lands. Mr. Epperson answered that in the interim agreement we were looking at trespass, trash buildup and reviewing the compliance of the lessees. We are down to two life estates. We want to go to law enforcement with forest service to handle it. There is not a lot of the original agreement left. It is easy to have forest service take that over. As we are looking at this we may not mention the economics but we want to keep that in mind. The public have

expressed interest in very limited activity in open space area. It is not cost effective for Casitas to manage that. The Forest Service is set up for handling those things. We thought that might work better in the long run. President Baggerly asked how far they were in the process with the Forrest Service. Mr. Epperson answered that they had two interagency agreements with the Forest Service. President Baggerly asked where the law enforcement would be located. Mr. Epperson answered the headquarters of law enforcement is in Santa Maria. They operate out of Ojai and have used the Selby property in open space. President Baggerly asked if you envision that to expand. Mr. Epperson answered yes. President Baggerly asked if it is habitable. Mr. Epperson answered no. They are in the process of developing the specifications and actions to restore the house. It may not be able to handle a large amount of activity and personnel as they had anticipated. They may use a bunk house rather than the house. Mr. Delamore added that there was no decision in terms of where law enforcement would be located. Mr. Epperson mentioned that at the beginning they had people staying in the house. They were on site for two to three months.

President Baggerly asked about the two interagency agreements. Based on the fact of those agreements and activity that happens on open space land may affect water quality at Casitas is it possible to review the agreements? Mr. Epperson answered sure. They are broad brush at this point. We have asked them to develop more detailed plans and agreements. Mr. Delamore added the open space land continues to be part of RMP planning. President Baggerly asked if Casitas is no longer involved with operations and maintenance of open space lands we are only dealing obliquely not directly. Mr. Kellogg added that all impacts will be addressed in the document that we produce.

President Baggerly asked about the disposition of movement of the existing fire station to open space lands? Mr. Epperson responded the RMP is setting a set of limits on what we might do over the next 25 years. Looking at based on the fact you have had in the past or the Forest Service has had problems with the sewage system above the lake and piping effluent across coyote creek to land spread it, the current location is not a long term solution beneficial to the lake. There is risk associated with it. We think it would be more beneficial to get it off of 150 to provide same services with lower risk to water quality. President Baggerly asked if the move is in the plan over the span of 25 years and contingent on the will and grace of congress. Mr. Epperson answered yes; if they do not provide the funding nothing will happen. Director Word asked where the service would be provided from. Mr. Epperson answered the USDA Forrest Service would provide. They would continue to pay for that long term. Reclamation is not in the fire business. Reclamation built the fire station for the Forest Service. National fire plan, National Parks, Forest Service and Fish & Wildlife are part of reciprocal agreement. They share firefighting resources. That has not been available to Bureau. In a meeting after the June public information session they agreed that because we are providing facilities for the fire station land they would be able to go through the format they use with rural fire departments. Offering those facilities they would count that as credit and write a reciprocal agreement to fight fires on our property at no cost to Reclamation or Casitas. Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Epperson to supply the two agreements with the Forest Service He agreed to do so.

Mr. Epperson said to keep in mind, 1. Providing water to users is the purpose of the reservoir. 2. Anything we do in addition is secondary purpose for recreation. We have to make sure there is a good balance between the environment and demand for recreation, 3. Make sure that alternatives are economically feasible. We are not interested in something that will make the management partner go broke. The alternatives have flexibility to meet change in demands of recreation.

Mr. Kellogg added there are several recommendations for vegetation, fisheries management, and fire management plan. The approach is these are sub components to the overall program. As Recreation demands change these plans can be tweaked. President Baggerly added that changes in environmental impact report if it doesn't change the conclusion those are the bookends. Mr. Kellogg added this does not cover major new service disturbance. Mowing the lawn is not a trigger. A new amphitheater would require another document; site specific assessment. President Baggerly asked if it is good enough for Fish & Wildlife to accept as NEPA. Mr. Kellogg replied that is what we are hoping. Mr. Epperson added we are setting the sideboards on the maximum amount. In the open space we agree you want as little that might wash down the watershed into the lake. Not that the houses are going away, more of an actual environment. Rather than to suggest we put five lazy rivers in open space, we will keep that more passive. The immediate area around the lake we want to keep intensive development. Intensive things here with least probable problems to the environment. Because if we build a new lazy river or put in changes for new RV site for group camp there will be a project level environmental document. President Baggerly asked if it would be EIS/EIR? Mr. Epperson said they have done some research with legal people on the issue. He believes we could do it as entering into the interim agreement that would give the basis of doing CEQA on the RMP. The Interim agreement has been worked on for some years with state parks and we have been modifying it to fit your situation more. It is similar to what we are doing with Santa Barbara County. The Exhibit reflects environmental with one working with state parks. They are going to look at what is ground disturbance for normal routine maintenance. Try to do that and this description gives an outline about 6 pages that would give you the process for joint CEQA/NEPA all the way through. EIS/EIR/EA/IS CE/CE do them parallel, single public review process and shorten up the time. That is something we want to put in here. Would like to see joint CEQA/NEPA projects. President Baggerly suggested attendance at NEPA seminars. Mr. Epperson answered it would be helpful. There are only two or three major differences between CEQA & NEPA. CEQA has findings of significance. CEQA looks at cumulative effects versus long term for NEPA. President Baggerly asked if it can be done in one document. Mr. Epperson responded yes. Cal Trans does every one that way. State parks is pleased we have started working on it.

Mr. Johnson asked about the alternatives on the RMP. Water is paramount to users. Water Quality is also paramount. We haul all of the wastes of the recreation area out of the area. Are you going to do that for the fire station? Are you going to limit what they have there for no spill in the lake? Will they have storage facilities with gas? Mr. Epperson replied you are not asking project specific. Mr. Delamore added any relocation would have to address those issues and have no impact to water quality to Lake Casitas. There would be a site specific assessment. Mr. Kellogg added many things may be allowed but when it gets to project specific impact assessment they may be denied. Mr.

Epperson added that we can't anticipate if an endangered species may move in or out, technology or other standards come into play. At that time, determine the reasonable amount to ensure there is no threat to water quality.

President Baggerly added as I read the interim agreement our discretion is partially based on your discretion. Mr. Epperson answered to some degree. President Baggerly asked if what we do here, if we are partners in this plan, effort and endeavor, if we decide not to do something can you decide that we should do it anyway? Mr. Epperson replied if you are thinking in terms of spending money out of a trust fund no. President Baggerly replied if we decide not to do body contact can you tell us to do it? Mr. Epperson replied that we would not do. Mr. Delamore added he doesn't see how we could. Mr. Epperson added we might overrule you on fire station. If we felt there was no other way and it was imperative we get that station out of there and we feel comfortable that proper ground monitoring etcetera will deal with it but you are still uncomfortable, we might say these are reasonable risks. President Baggerly then said congress gave you and you gave us the responsibility of caring for that land. You change that and give it to Forest Service. Mr. Epperson replied that remember that you may not be managing open space but anything done will have to have project level environmental and you will have an opportunity to comment on it. The Government could overrule if there are some serious thing that we need to deal with that extends beyond the view that you have taken. President Baggerly added you would have the opportunity to review every environmental we prepare. Mr. Epperson answered yes. The Management Agreement is short term and more limiting, when we have a long term agreement you are a managing partner. He added that there is still no new development only because have not finished environmental process. There might be some other changes.

Mrs. Baggerly asked if we will leave with an amended list, without narrative from the consultant that we were promised this month. We asked about a map and list but have no information that goes along with it. How do you expect the board to make decisions about what they want? Mr. Kellogg replied it is the opposite. In order to write the plan we need detail. It seems to work, to agree on basic actions then write the narrative. Mrs. Baggerly added you mentioned a general plan and then the plan is written. Mr. Kellogg disagreed. This is not the plan. You will be reviewing the plan. When writing a plan we need to start somewhere. This is the beginning of the plan and the process. The plan will be reviewed. Mrs. Baggerly added that at a public hearing in 1999 and other meetings and none of those comments are included in here. You took this chart and turned out this information and all the work before is not presented here. Mr. Epperson responded this is based on comments we received. Part of the approach here is a cost saving measure. We want to meet with the board and get their input on this outline before we write the document. Cost of major rewrites is more than the budget allows. This worked out well with State Parks and the County of Santa Barbara. This comes to the board first and we work through it. This is what we saw from the public scoping meetings and studies on the ground. He continued are there things here that make sense? There may be changes in this today. Then we will go back and write the administrative draft which will go back to the board and will then have a full narrative then take those comments and write the final draft which would then go to the public hearing.

President Baggerly suggested that we scratch body contact. Mr. Kellogg said we can get to that.

Mr. Kellogg explained that table 2-1 and 2-2 are all public comments from 1999. Table 2 looks at issues, opportunities and constraints. Alternative 1 is called baseline or no action. It is a benchmark, an accurate representation of what is on the ground now. He went on to explain that alternative 2 is expanded while alternative 3 is expanded with more intensive use. Level 2 is a lower level of used.

Director Word commented on watershed protection only. It is difficult to determine what priority would be in alternative 2 or 3. It would lead me to think that is not a criterion for enhanced. Mr. Kellogg suggested leave only out and put dots in 2 & 3.

Mr. Johnson commented on hiking and biking on open space lands. Mr. Kellogg explained it was put in because limited day use is happening on existing open space lands. There are people out there walking around. Mr. Johnson added it has never been permitted you are saying because people use it anyway it is an accepted use. President Baggerly added even though it is trespass. Mr. Johnson continued I don't know how the use trespass would be considered continued use. Mr. Kellogg replied it makes impact analysis difficult. Mr. Epperson added that local residents are in there. Mr. Johnson said the problem is people complying with law, you are saying you give credibility to people that trespass. Mr. Kellogg responded that is a difficult point. I don't know what to say. Mr. Johnson said you acknowledge trespass as use. Mr. Epperson added that walking along county roads is not trespass. Mr. Johnson added it says hiking and biking on unimproved roads. Mr. Epperson suggested that they delete unimproved roads. Mr. Kellogg added that the second line is trails. Mr. Epperson said that is why we put it in. Recognizing there might have been trespass but the fact that not putting it out there. To Steve's point people have gone in there four wheeling and damaged the environment. Mr. Kellogg added in a table like this, in the narrative, we will end up with new trails to have restrictions on these trails. Director Word added does that imply that they will be created. Mr. Kellogg replied they will be designated /created by Forest Service and signed. Director Word mentioned that for several years we have wanted to improve our bike path/trail to make them safer and more usable within confines of recreation area. Where does that come in? Mr. Kellogg explained it is a few pages away. Steve a few pages away.

President Baggerly asked where are the areas south of Highway 150 that you are considering limited tent camping. Mr. Epperson explained looking to put higher end uses closer to the water and move some of the tent camping, lower impact, dollar value further away and continue to offer to the public the same range of things today. President Baggerly asked if you can transfer it to the recreation area. It would be confusing if a portion is now in Teague Memorial Watershed and transfer to recreation area and make it clear. Mr. Epperson explained that administratively it can be done in long term agreement. The long term agreement will put more specific boundaries so this would be an area managing under the long term agreement. Because land purchased under Teague Watershed bill there are certain requirements that will have to go with it. The Management agreement allows us to consolidate our bills and put in one pocket. Mr.

Epperson added that looking at open space area and some portion would be appropriate to include in recreation area. Others of it might be let the Forest Service to deal with. Director Word added concerns over increased controlling and managing of an expansion of camping such as tent camping. Tent camping areas are most difficult to manage and control. Most of the problems come out of the tent camping area. Mr. Roney added that is correct. Director Word added to expand that and make it more remote is difficult for camp administration. Mr. Kellogg explained if it is left in expanded and you do an impact analysis if it ended up with alternative 2 we could pull it back.

Mr. Roney asked about the low impact recreation use. Is that managed by whom? Mr. Kellogg replied it will be open space in long term agreement you would have control over, the space south of Highway 150.

Jack Gilooly asked about the watershed or open space lands deeded to Forest Service of Arrangement of BOR and FS on management of lands or will CMWD need to set up a separate administrative agreement to oversee campgrounds that may be Forest Service management lands. Mr. Epperson explained that ownership is not going to change. Ownership will remain with BOR. They have a responsibility under law that will apply to a management agreement with Forest Service or Casitas. It will stay the land of the United States. The management agreement with Casitas is to manage the area. Mr. Gilooly asked about concern of the board for conflicts. Casitas would be moved a step down once Forest Service is in there. Casitas would have to deal with Forest Service or Bureau of Reclamation. Who mediates? Mr. Epperson said it would depend on the event. Projects for environmental review BOR take lead. Mr. Delamore added the underlying purpose of why the land was purchased has to be consistent with the purpose of those open space lands. Mr. Epperson added the Bureau of Reclamation is given authority to manage the land for recreation and restoring it to some more natural condition and to make sure that the watershed is protected to protect water quality at Casitas. If fire station is needed to manage it then fire and erosion into casitas is a big water quality problem. To manage a fire station may be appropriate.

Regarding Fire Management, Mr. Roney said there are no baseline hand crew incident command activities now. Mr. Epperson responded there are. Hand crews do go over by the fire station and cut down weeds as training for hand work. Fire station is used as an incident command station if there is a fire. Director Word asked if they would be relocating training and incidental command activities. Mr. Epperson said there might be an incident command center set up for a fire. They do that at Lake Cachuma Live Oak. Director Word said this says relocate. Mr. Kellogg suggested removal of the dot from alternative 1. Mr. Epperson suggested that deleting the word relocate would do it. Mr. Roney suggested that there currently is a helipad baseline in the open space. Mr. Kellogg asked about a fire management plan. Mr. Roney explained they have a plan for clearing brush and annual fire clearances but that is it. Maintains fire breaks within and outside the park. Mr. Delamore that the narrative might be the best place to address this.

Invasive species – Director Word thought the baseline should show that we do that now. Mr. Epperson suggested that current efforts were not targeting a specific species.

Mr. Wignot asked if an integrated pest management plan is required. Mr. Epperson responded it is a detail in the RMP that will call out a requirement. Pest management should be put into open space lands since it is mentioned in recreation lands.

Education/Interpretation – Mr. Kellogg added we are not saying where this would be located. Director Word suggested that they not use one of the houses. Mr. Kellogg explained that there is a broad concept for an interpretive center. Mr. Epperson explained that apparently through some mistake or accident all houses were included in the federal inventory. The Interim contract for open space calls for removal. The law talks about removal and we demolished apparently we did not go through a process for surveying these properties out. They are asking for dates they were demolished and documentation for authority and if procedures were followed. Law said get rid of and should never have gone on an inventory. President Baggerly asked who is asking. Mr. Epperson replied Denver is asking.

Mr. Kellogg spoke about guided day hikes from the park. This could be from the park into open space lands. Mr. Epperson explained that the original thing that kicked this off was comment from Center for Earth Concerns pontoon boat. Talking about having nature hikes into open space with a docent. Director Word said that would fall under a category may never be implemented. President Baggerly asked why the Forest Service wouldn't coordinate it. Mr. Kellogg replied they could. Mr. Epperson explained there are some unique geological features there. President Baggerly asked if it is rare enough that research should be included. Mr. Epperson explained it is more of an example that was close enough to get to and see. President Baggerly asked Jack Gilooly if Audubon be interested in including bird watching. Mr. Gilooly responded guided organized groups, for research. They would need to be organized and guided.

Mr. Kellogg spoke about the total of 413 campsites. He asked for a verification of the boat speed limit. Mr. Roney explained on a map they are currently using it indicates 15 mph in coves. An old map says 5 mph. Mr. Kellogg suggested leaving it at 15 and added some coves. He suggested the line below 15 mph be removed completely where it says reduced speed limits

Mr. Roney spoke about no night boating. On baseline there is night boating allowed for bass tournaments and changes that to night boating associated with fishing. Mr. Kellogg said it should change to be what it should be. Director Word added it is regulated. Mr. Epperson asked if it is a special use permit. Mr. Roney said to take out no and add regulated night boating. Mr. Roney said kayak canoe does not show any size and it is up to 35 but can go less than yet. It can go as low as 6 feet for small kayak with special permit.

Director Word added this says maintain total number of existing campsites. We have talked about expanding. Mr. Kellogg suggested removing maintain and say existing. Director Word added we proposed some changes that would reduce number of sites slightly. Mr. Kellogg explained that is covered under several sites for converting sites. Director Word added I don't think this is right. Existing total what is there now.

Body contact – Director Word asked we this was out in there? Mr. Kellogg explained that we should we have some boat density and water-ski days. Own recommendation was probably not and leave boating management plan it would say what is the appropriate density. Director Word asked do we have to include body contact. Mr. Kellogg replied that Federal and CEQA and NEPA documents consider reasonable range of alternatives. We do have a number of requests from public comments and it is about evenly split. Think we would have severe criticism if we ignored half of the public. Mr. Delamore added if someone wanted to challenge NEPA and we have not considered all reasonable alternatives. If we exclude it we have to have firm reason. Mr. Johnson added state law says you can't put body contact on a terminal lake. Mr. Kellogg added that their research showed that the law exempted a number of lakes and said for any other lake to require exemption get their congressman to get legislation to change and have proper treatment to protect the water. Potential impacts are increased treatment. Other lakes have gotten exemptions. Director Word added that the congressman said they are not going to do this unless there is a big majority to approve they would not support it. Mr. Kellogg added in regional discussion address how surrounding lakes deal with this. Mr. Johnson added the analysis we did on body contact issues indicated district would have to go into substantial law enforcement activity on the lake that we don't have and it would never be fundable by us. Mr. Epperson suggested that if people want to pay \$100 a day... Mr. Johnson answered we could not do it for \$100 a day. Mr. Kellogg added as a side bar we do not have personal watercraft under all alternatives. It is too small lake to add jet skis.

President Baggerly called for a brief break at 10:25 a.m. President Baggerly reconvened the session at 10:40 p.m.

There was discussion regarding boating at the South west end of lake at Ayers Creek. Mr. Johnson asked why that changing is. It is a water quality issue. This area feeds directly into the intake. There is also the issue of the security of the dam. Mr. Johnson explained that the area in which you are suggesting to move the line is where the aeration system is. Mr. Johnson continued this is a security issue and water quality issue. It is not a good idea. Mr. Kellogg suggested that it is not a security issue as it would not be any closer than you already are. President Baggerly added the primary issue is dam security and water quality and water security. These are important issues and we need not quibble about this opportunity for recreation. This should be taken out and be firm with it. Mr. Delamore added this is all elements of alternatives that get evaluated. They are not elements that get selected as preferred plan. There are good arguments that we would not select this. We want to put out a document that meets the requirements. President Baggerly commented if reasonable evaluated based on primary purpose of lake and dam it will not be anything to get close to. Mr. Roney added it is protected by ordinance. Mr. Johnson added there is plenty of opportunity for recreation on the rest of that lake. There is nothing for review. It is a water quality and security issue. You should take it out and leave it out. Mr. Epperson added as Mike is saying it is there to make sure it is not a challenged document. Mr. Johnson replied we aren't saying that people can't have boating or hiking this is a section of the lake we have set aside to protect water quality and the dam. There is no need to reevaluate that decision. How is it an alternative that could be challenged? Mr. Epperson suggested putting it in a section those alternatives considered and withdrawn. If somebody wants that and wants to challenge the plan one



of the grounds is you have not considered reasonable alternatives. It should be listed as considered and withdrawn.

Mr. Epperson added the area is acting like the marine preserve around the Channel Islands. Mr. Kellogg suggested that the first line will stay with the rest deleted and a section in the back of the document that the alternative was considered but deleted.

Under group camping and the barrow road area the only access is past the dam which is closed to public. Mr. Kellogg asked if access was ever provided any other way. Mr. Roney explained that access by boat would be determined by water level. Mr. Johnson suggested leaving it the way it is. Access is limited and non-existent at this point to the public.

On the north end Mr. Roney suggested a dot under baseline to convert tent sites to RV sites. If you have given approval for that would love to do it. Mr. Kellogg said he would change that to 2 & 3.

Director Word asked if the issue of full day and camping use, paved trails for bikes should be baseline however paving the trails for bikes is what we have tried to do. Mr. Roney included music events also include special events. Mr. Epperson said all things are currently available. Mr. Johnson added it took 30 years to put the 1970 plan into effect and you withdrew it. Mr. Epperson explained that the guidelines do a 25 year plan and redo it every ten years.

Regarding the model airstrip Director Word explains it now draws people in with either a frequent visitor card or daily access and provides entertainment to other campers. Access from Highway 150 would eliminate our ability to charge. Mr. Epperson suggested having a concession contract with them and figures out the fees. He continued we are not thinking about moving it until we heard talk about relocating this to consider developing this for camping for better use. In the future as population continues to grow that may be something you want to consider. Mr. Johnson said you have to understand. Visitor days have not changed in 18 years. We have had steady visitor days for 23 years or more. We put in significant facilities without the help of Reclamation and we have had no increase in visitor days. Mr. Epperson said that over the last five years you have done a lot of things, Brian Roney has put a lot into it and a change in concession for camp trailers over time, these are the kind of things Brian is trying to put in. Putting that together you can increase your user ships and achieve more. Mr. Epperson continued that studies from Reclamation are that at recreation sites under the jurisdiction of Reclamation the average amount of money the use is willing to pay for services vs. what they do pay is \$26 per person. Mr. Johnson said visitor days do not go up. What is going on is recreation is losing concessions because they can't make money to keep going. Brian keeps saying people have a lot of choices. It is not a facility issue. There are a lot of choices and if we don't keep the facilities up they will go someplace else. Mr. Roney added that National Park statistics show camping is down and they have not developed RV sites. State parks same issue.

President Baggerly returned the conversation to the air strip. Mr. Johnson commented that he did not think it should be moved. We may need to consider eliminating it for other

uses. Mr. Kellogg added we could do both. We are not saying we have to move it but why remove it? We could say move or remove it? Both Mr. Johnson and Director Word said that would be fine.

Regarding the Marina, Mr. Kellogg said we don't have to put capacity in here. Mr. Roney explained there is not a lot of boat activity. It is limited by parking stalls. 275 stalls total could be limit but have car toppers. It is self limiting. President Baggerly said that is existing sites. Mr. Roney suggested a dot under baseline. We are looking into issues of a kayak dock only open to kayaks. Leave in baseline to move to what works for us without considering it enhanced or expanded. Mr. Kellogg suggested a separate line. Mr. Roney added we would like to add another dock for kayakers not. Director Word asked how we add gates and security cameras. Mr. Roney explained these are Operations and Maintenance issues. Mr. Kellogg asked if it is under alternative one. Mr. Roney explained it kind of is. We have talked about putting cameras down there. We are considering or have plans for it now. President Baggerly said these are not recreational activities, why are they in there. Mr. Kellogg said it is for increased use. President Baggerly said the docks and boat launch should be in there. Mr. Epperson stated we may have gone into too much detail. Mr. Kellogg asked if a dot in one is accurate. Mr. Roney thought is should be under all three. Mr. Kellogg suggested a separate line to expand boat ramp alternative. It was also suggested to leave capacity out

Mrs. Baggerly asked about miscellaneous activities like disc golf and basketball? Mr. Kellogg explained it will be in the narrative.

Mr. Johnson said lets talk about the future. If you want other things done at the lake there needs to be a revenue source. There are limits on ADA, changing access ramps, limits on everything. Camping is the money maker. Mr. Epperson said that is an excellent point. Maybe what we need to do is try to restate these. When these were first done we had not talked about adding open space lands. Now if we make the change on the north end. Mr. Johnson added that it is clear to us that most of the tent camping disappears during the winter. RV continues. If you take or limit us on RV camping that limits the funding for the whole park. Mr. Kellogg suggested saying modify/improve some tent campsites. Second line would be modify/improve majority. He suggested we go back to words that are subjective. Some and majority are easy to live with. Mr. Johnson though majority is not quite there. It could mean 51% and no more. I would think you would want to have a word or words that would allow it to go higher than the majority. President Baggerly asked what the range for equitability is. Mr. Epperson said that over time that social justice number will decrease. Fewer people will be interested. Mr. Johnson suggested instead of saying a limit it to a certain mix say that the district may use some of the RV sites for tent camping. Mrs. Baggerly asked about sewage? Director Word added we have pumpable vaults. Mr. Epperson added we have talked about and would like to see at some point the terms of cost of pumping and hauling may get prohibitive and you may want to run a pipeline to sewer connection. Mr. Roney suggested a septic system. There was discussion regarding the relocation of the storage area. Mr. Epperson asked about the expansion of the camp store. Director Word said it is not listed. Mr. Roney thought it should be added as an option to relocate/expand camp store.

Mr. Gilooly suggested that the amphitheater seems it would be expanded not enhanced. There is no mention of associated parking facilities. Mr. Kellogg said it would be addressed in the statement. Mr. Gilooly said it is a large package deal. Such an expanded usage should be under enhanced, alternative 3. Mr. Roney explained that under enhanced we have 8,500 people there. It is not that big of an amphitheater. Director Word suggested leaving it under 2 & 3. Mr. Epperson explained that there is parking for that.

Mr. Johnson suggested going back to the tent camp sites. Could it be modified for multi use? Mr. Delamore said the balance mix of RV and tent could be to optimize RV camping. Mr. Johnson suggested that if multi use can include both tent and RV and other camping we could get away from concern of a social issue. If the site can be used for both it should not be an issue. Mr. Epperson added that the key thing in management should be a demand for tent camping that you don't chose the RV person over the tent. Mr. Kellogg added the multi use term is well accepted. Mr. Epperson explained that a Yurt is multi use. Mr. Roney suggested Yurts and other types of portable cabins. Mr. Kellogg said he will put a note to include yurts likes and others.

Mr. Kellogg suggested we move to trails. The second line states there are hiking biking 2 miles of existing trail. Make that lake hike trail and the next line improve/realign bike path and then connect to lake hike trail? Mr. Roney said they are separate. He added hiking and non motorized and suggested taking the 2 miles out. There was discussion of a Lake shore trail or a lake perimeter trail. There would be used around the dam. Perhaps it could go around except for the area of the dam. Director Hicks said it is 28 miles and would be perfect for a marathon. Mr. Kellogg suggested a trail management plan, something that talks about use of trails. Over time there tends to be conflict. Mr. Johnson said there are conflicts on boat docks. Mr. Epperson explained the Forest Service has a good trails standards books for any development. Mr. Kellogg asked if we should leave in development of new trails. Mr. Roney said to leave it in and perhaps a trail connecting campgrounds.

In the Utilities Mr. Kellogg questioned the floating restrooms. I don't know if it is expanding them but leave it in there. Mr. Johnson suggested improving physical facilities for other reasons including complying. Mr. Kellogg stated we have other physical improvements in other places. President Baggerly asked if you are talking about gas, electricity, sewage, and water? Mr. Epperson said we did not discuss power. Mr. Johnson added that power is an issue. It should all be included in that. Mr. Epperson added that any expansions if converting utilities and infrastructure are part of that and would be considered for that project.

In the area of cultural resource there was discussion regarding maintaining a fisheries management plan, suggesting vegetation. Mr. Epperson congratulated the District on its fisheries management plan. Casitas is ahead of others. Mr. Kellogg commented that we are not saying there should be prescribed burns. Director Word added they are not something we would do or undertake ourselves. Mr. Kellogg explained that vegetation management plans are elements to maintain proper management. President Baggerly asked about open space lands to the south of highway 150 if they are offered up as campsites you will have to evaluate impact on mountain lions. Mr. Kellogg said he would

remove the line. Maintain habitat. Every issue of this will be discussed. Mrs. Baggerly added improving habitat. Mr. Epperson explained that the most enhancements would occur in open space. Mr. Kellogg added that evaluation of habitat restoration programs are under both open space and the park.

Mr. Roney added that on native vegetation could we have interpretive programs of all three and add a base line and add a new line for nature center. On roads, second item, change word to controls from signage. He also mentioned he had a question on concessions.

Mr. Johnson expressed his concern about installing traffic safety signs and controls. Roads in the lake are not standard roads. Standard roads require all sorts of safety signs. They are trails. There is only minimal signage for trails. The District does not want to get into a discussion on standard safety standards all over the park. It would look like an urban area. Director Word suggested changing the wording of roads to trails. Mr. Kellogg suggested unimproved roads. Mr. Gilooly commented that unimproved road are dirt, not paved. Mr. Johnson replied that being paved doesn't make them roads. They are used for all sorts of things, vehicles, pedestrians and bikes, they have multiple usage. We refer to them as trails. We have to maintain that title or get into standardizing them as roads. Mr. Kellogg suggested changing the wording to access. Mr. Johnson said o.k.

Mr. Kellogg then said they had received comments from the public that were concerned about traffic on Highways 33 and 150 and suggested signs direct traffic to Casitas along Santa Ana Road. Mr. Roney explained that boats pull off and drive up that route. The majority do use that access. The issue is with the County. Feedback from residents was they did not want to sign it as the primary access route. Signage now directs to Baldwin Road. Mr. Kellogg replied he will take it out.

Mr. Roney asked about the park entrance access and that they have talked about different traffic flows at gate. We need to make sure that is included there. Mr. Epperson explained that they are not considering adding new lanes, not changing capacity. The problem is that the canopy over the entry way that conflicts with RVs.

A 30 minute recess was taken for lunch.

4. Discussion of the interim agreements proposed by both Casitas and the Bureau of Reclamation for the operation of recreation for the interim until the adoption of the Resource Management Plan.

President Baggerly reconvened the meeting at 12:30 p.m.

Mr. Epperson informed the board that the interim agreement is a draft they have been working on with state parks. It addresses how does money go and where. Basically, the water district is in trespass on the property because you do not have the authority beyond the nine picnic tables beyond original contract. There are two choices. Either say no or to give you unilateral permission and at that point we are bound by regulations that any of the receipts we can't waive and we have to collect and send to the government. We can only waive for those according to 43 CFR 429 if in a contract.

President Baggerly said you are telling Casitas to take a hike, or it is alright but the Bureau gets all the money or an agreement. Mr. Epperson said we are not taking any but asking to put it in a place to be used for the public benefit. Director Word asked how this different from the way we have been doing it. Mr. Epperson said he is not saying it has not been used for public benefit. Incidental revenues unless we have an agreement. With an agreement you have the right to collect certain fees and operate certain things and cover your expenses. We are asking that you set aside a portion of that to build up a reserve that can be used for major capital improvements or other things that need to be done along the way. An earlier contract with Santa Barbara County it is set up so that anything over your operating expenses gets turned back to the government. The provision is you can save up to five years any proceeds over operating expense to be used for capital improvements. Results have sewer out of date, no parts at Santa Barbara County at Cachuma. To avoid those kinds of problems and to make sure that say you had a year where there is a windfall and revenue is far in excess there is a provision it could go into the trust fund to be used over time. Director Word asked what surplus. Mr. Epperson said it is hypothetical. President Baggerly commented on relying on the Federal Water Recreation Project Act. 43 CFR contains Bureau's regulation.

Director Word said before we get into what you have listed here as an interim agreement, explain what changed in the last 40 years to say that we were operating under some agreement and that has expired? What changed? Mr. Epperson said the history is that at the time that the dam was completed and the minimum basic recreation facilities called out in the project feasibility project, not all were built but gate house, a restroom over there, 9 picnic tables and a mile and half of road. Those things were built. Water District formed under Municipal Water District Act of 1911 and did not have authority to operate recreation. Various people consulted and lawyers wrote there should be an agreement between Water District and Reclamation for management of recreation. You did not have authority and it was awkward. They relied, you can manage to prevent chaos you were given ability to manage that minimum basic requirements. All conversations between your attorneys and government were in a few years you should enter into an agreement to have the agreement called for in the regulations to deal with the revenue issues. Director Word asked where that is stated. Mr. Epperson said this was conversation that occurred between. Director Word asked if we have a record of that. Mr. Epperson replied he sent a copy to Mr. Johnson a few years ago. Mr. Johnson commented that he got old agreement but not any record of any conversation. They don't talk to any conversations between people about an agreement. Mr. Epperson replied those records is what I mean.

Director Hicks asked why should new agreement remove all other previous agreements. Why does it cancel out? We have the original agreement from 1957. Mr. Epperson answered that agreement was really to operate the project works. Really intended to give the authority that you do have to operate the dam and distribution facilities. It was a temporary stop gap since there were such limited facilities and they were authorized by congress, we will allow it and were anticipating the law to be changed. The Law was not changed until 1974. In 1961 you got your first Boating and Waterways grant. At that point we, Reclamation will lease this land to state of California. The State of California sublet it to you. That went for 20 years from 1961 to 1981. In 1970 you built the second

boat ramp with Boating & Waterways funds. Reclamation amended the lease that expired in 1990. Mr. Johnson added you only amended one of the two leases. You amended it to the lease for California Parks. You did not amend our lease. Mr. Epperson replied your lease was with them. If they failed to amend their lease then yours expired in 1981. We assumed they followed through and amended yours to 1990.

Director Baggerly stated that but for the fact in 1957 or 1958 under the 1911 Municipal Water Act we did not have the specific authority to perform those duties and responsibilities with recreation. In the 1960s the law changes and we do have the authority in 1974. What is so different about our responsibilities for recreation for Reclamation to continue to do those duties? Original congressional act included boating, fishing, hiking, birds watching and a plethora of recreation activities. It was not focused on 9 tables. There was a reasonable expectation was that this was going to be a popular site. Mr. Epperson said at the time the intent and expectation was that whoever was considered and even Ventura County Parks was considered for Recreation manager. The Water district took it over. We discovered a legal problem you have no authority. Mr. Epperson continued we said we can misconstrue agreement for operating the works to include these minimal basic requirements but nothing beyond that. Mr. Johnson asked what we have that is other than minimum basic requirements. Mr. Epperson replied it is defined in the bill. Mr. Johnson said it is defined in the report. Director Hicks referenced the report which talks about 5 miles of road, RV and camp sites, playgrounds and pools. They are all there.

Mr. Epperson asked what was authorized in appropriation bill. Director Word answered \$500,000. Mr. Delamore added you are reading from the feasibility report. Mr. Johnson said the issue is that we have done it for many years. The leases that you talked about have nothing to do with the authorization to do it that way. We never got an authorization directly from you. Mr. Epperson added that is what we are trying to correct. Mr. Johnson added we have operated 46-47 years without it. Mr. Epperson said that is inappropriate. Mr. Johnson suggested looking at the economics. In operating the way we have for the last 18 years while I have been here, before that they lost about 2 million dollars, we operate pretty much balanced. Paying for improvements has not gotten done. Your agreement says we have to do it. California voter adopted Proposition 218 and the District can not collect from water customers any more than the pro-rated cost of service to provide water to that property. There is no way to charge water customers for recreation area. We have operated for the last 18 years and have not achieved what you say we have to in this agreement. Brian did a study and 85 % of customers come from outside the district. Mr. Johnson continued you are asking us to pay for the recreation facilities of maybe 5% of 750,000 roughly 560,000 people don't pay money to district, give money to you and have obligation to come up with the extra money. Does that sound like a problem? Mr. Delamore answered it does not sound like what we are trying to do. Mr. Johnson said you want us to establish a maintenance fund and we have to pay for everything. We have not been able to pay for everything to date. Director Word added you require us to set aside 10% of gross. Mr. Johnson added we are still several million down. How are we going to do this? Mr. Epperson said assuming the law said from this day forward. Mr. Johnson said it does not say that. The fact remains in operating that facility as best as we can have not broken even, paid quite a bit of capital costs but have not done it. Don't see how we can do it. Mr. Roney added you

have admitted we are one of the best run facilities you have seen. Mr. Johnson asked how do we do it. We can't do it. We can't do what the contract says economically. Can't break even. Have to come up with funds. President Baggerly added we need to talk.

Director Word said you still haven't explained what changed. Mr. Epperson said we never did get the agreement that was supposed to happen. It was expected that within a year or two you would enter into an agreement. Mr. Johnson asked is it a letter or those agreements? Mr. Epperson said it is a letter of the attorney of the district at the time. He said he would dig it back out. Mr. Roney added we don't we have documentation that project lands were transferred. Mr. Johnson added we have a newspaper clipping with our attorney taking the repayment agreement to court and ensuring it was legal. We would be happy to share it with you.

Mr. Roney added in general, the agreement is treating us more like a concessionaire than a managing partner. Forest Service and Pyramid Lake for example, they turn it over for operation. You want us to ask for approval on everything. State of California owns Castaic, they don't operate it, and they have a MOU with LA County Parks & Recreation. It does not contain anything like this. We operate within local, state, federal laws, do normal process for things. It would not be restrictive. We could operate as best you see fit, offer recreation at a reasonable price. LA County would never agree to this unless heavily subsidized and district can't subsidize it. Mr. Epperson said if we have an agreement or not, according to Proposition 218 you have to operate it 100% on pay as go. Mr. Roney said we have been doing that and willing to figure out how to make that happen. This says we have to take 10% off top for trust fund.

Mr. Johnson added there are years where we make surplus and others where we lost a lot. Who is going to make up the loss? In the past it was taken out of water fund. We can't do it anymore. Mr. Epperson said it will operate only with revenue from recreation. All revenue will stay on site to operate recreation. Mr. Johnson commented that the agreement states we have to go back in and repair and keep up to a standard. I don't have the money to do that.

President Baggerly added the interim on the Federal Water Recreation Project Act of 1992. There are several changes; each one has a joint funding for Reclamation and the Managing Partner up to 50% for operations and maintenance. Where did it go? Mr. Epperson explained there are two pieces. One, a commissioners policy are able to contribute up to 50% of capital improvement and Operation & Maintenance. The policy is we do not contribute to O & M. We can contribute to capital improvements if we have an agreement. Mr. Johnson said this agreement says you have no responsibility to pay anything. Mr. Delamore added there could be a clause put in there subject to appropriations of funds. Mr. Johnson asked what do we do if you don't appropriate funds. Mr. Johnson said we won't see if for three years. Mr. Roney added we have to get improvements in to pay the bills. Your agreement says I can't start improvements until the RMP is done. Are you going to operate it for me? Mr. Epperson said you are still stuck with the same dollars. They are not going anywhere else. We would have an opportunity to establish a budget line to facilitate this. 10%, if you gross \$3 million that is \$300,000 that would provide 50% match to 300,000 as we are currently providing

every other reservoir. Mr. Epperson added it is left in the property section that was being discussed with State of California and there are different rules. Mr. Johnson said you want us to give you \$ 3 million of water funds that we can't collect. Mr. Epperson said you are right that is what this says. What we intend to put in there, when we talked in December, this is a skeleton. Mr. Johnson added if it is a skeleton, you have the ability to control water levels. Mr. Epperson said it goes to safety of dams program, if fault may require reservoir levels to be reduced they could direct district to lower to a safe level. Mr. Johnson said that is not what that means. Are you willing to pay for the water you release? Mr. Epperson said Cachuma went through the same thing with spill condition in 1998. Bureau lowered it from 750 to 733. Thousands of acre feet of water went down river. Mr. Johnson asked who owns water rights. We own water rights here. You are asking us to authorize you to tell us to lower the lake. Mr. Epperson said the intent was safety of dams. Mr. Roney said it says it is for project purposes. Mr. Johnson added it seems out of place for this agreement. Mr. Epperson said the intent was that we are trying to recognize that water operations have a priority over recreation. Original document was with state parks and they did not run water at Folsom. We are trying to put in if anyone came back at it to recognize that is a priority over recreation. There could be a seismic retrofit that may ask for a change. Would have to discuss with government who is accounting with government on the water since it is your water. He continued that this was an early, rapidly put together draft. The other thing is on how do we get the money. There is one section that talks about property. The State of California and Denver office's point of view is that if you build on our property is it is ours, thank you. Santa Barbara County has set up stewardship investments. Government may provide some funding for. Stewardship investment may be on federal land but owned by others. Mr. Johnson asked how does state get involved. Mr. Epperson said this was a draft we are trying to switch for your situation. Mr. Delamore added that Bob has taken some existing agreements and tried to tailor them here. They are concepts that we want to flush out today and not negotiate specific words.

Director Hicks asked if the execution of an interim agreement would terminate and supercede all other agreements. This one is only talking about recreation. The 1957 agreement would still stand. Mr. Epperson said we are only dealing with recreation.

Mr. Roney thought it was unreasonable to discuss this agreement. We operate 46 years, and continue to make it work. There are so many restrictions in this agreement. You require approval of everything, special events, filming, concession, setting of fees. All the boards' authority would be transferred to you. Mr. Epperson said the regulations require the land management agreement. This is the kind of document that other states are recommending. This is the direction they want to go in terms of management agreements with managing partners. Mr. Wignot added we can work on the language. That is not our intent. We are not interested in micro managing this area.

Director Word said on page 13 and 15. 6 d and 7 c. It speaks to depositing 10% annual gross revenue. 7 c. Only 7 c not too much of a problem. Some years \$200,000 surplus, some \$120,000 loss. If started off with 10% of gross, set aside and restrict loss would be more. Excess over all expenses and what we are doing is we are paying down the dept that recreation owes. Mr. Epperson said in no way do we expect you to forgive debt. Director Word added that 10% of gross is micromanaging. Mr. Roney added it would



have to be a line item budgeted expense. Director Word said there is no room for 10% to come off top. President Baggerly added that breaking even is so close many years there won't be 10% to set aside and we have substantial losses in many years.

Mr. Epperson explained that setting aside 10% could be invested in lazy river, or debt load; the ten percent could be applied to that. Possible way of dealing with 6d in the budget. Director Word asked why 6 d can't be same as 7 c without a percent.

Mr. Johnson added we have the same problem here. We have not generated a dollar in excess of our costs. We are in deficit for over \$2 million dollars. Mr. Epperson said there is a way here to cover those costs. Mr. Johnson asked if he needs your permission to cover my costs. Mr. Epperson replied he hopes he is not unreasonable. Mr. Johnson replied your agreement is verging on unreasonable. Mr. Epperson replied that regulation says excess goes to treasury. Mr. Johnson replied the regulation says you pay 50%. Mr. Epperson said the 50% thing is different. There is not a law says we pay 50% of everything. If budgeted we may help you.

Director Word explained that when the lake is low, attendance is low and revenue drops. When the Lake is full it peaks a bit. Those years when it is down we have nothing to draw on anymore. 10% off top is unreasonable in a business sense for our situation. Mr. Epperson said the numbers are negotiable. Director Word said it is the concept we have a problem with.

Mr. Epperson said ownership through stewardship investment concept circular A 102 which handles grants. We would be able to say you have at least a possessory interest, ownership of your facilities and that is something that can be used as collateral for a loan. There are provisions if you decide to discontinue recreation and we go to someone else, those regulations provide for the government to say we are changing people and we would like your assets. It is a procedure to determine how we pay for the residual value. Director Word asked if we decided not to operate recreation at this point the Bureau would pay us for the assets. Mr. Epperson said depreciation, if given to someone else it would be sold. You have a way to talk to bank at end of agreement the collateral is protected. Don't anticipate acting on that. Mr. Johnson said you are proposing use collateral on facilities we bought with our money to get a loan. You are at a disadvantage of what those numbers are. It takes all the money we get out of the operation to operate it. There is no excess. Like your concerns with Cachuma. It does not generate enough money to pay all bills. Mr. Roney added their overhead is \$120,000 to the county. Director Word said the overhead here is \$600,000. Mr. Wignot explained there are interdepartmental transfers within the county. Director Word said it is subsidized; there is never any excess revenue.

Director Hicks said he has been on the board for 17 years and saw what district was like before John Johnson came here. He said his feelings are hurt more than anything. The board has done things to improve recreation area. When I came on we had pit toilets, Santa Ana ramp was not very good, and the rangers had guns. It was a mess and we were losing \$200,000 a year. We have nice facilities. You have taken this to another level. My perception is we are being hog tied. We are like the good kid who went to college and got a job and seems like we are being penalized for doing the right things. We

provide a good water supply, built a treatment plant and a fish ladder. Now we are being penalized. It hurts.

Mr. Epperson responded that the intent is not to penalize you. We are trying to encourage discipline in financial management. Director Word asked how we would improve it. Mr. Johnson suggested he come in and run it yourself for a while. We have only three or 4 park services offices and use camp hosts. We have done everything we can do to make it better and then we are handcuffed.

President Baggerly asked about the Regional Director who set policy that Federal Project Recreation Management Act which says you may pay up to 50% for capital and maintenance if your region or reclamation has the ability to set policy. What kind of wiggle room do we have for looking at changes in this document? Is there any latitude, can we slash out and rewrite? Mr. Roney added that we did put an interim agreement together. Mr. Johnson added we can support why we put everything in that. We can't pay it all. All funds into the operations we can barely balance. Mr. Delamore added our desire to pay half costs is only worth a quarter.

Mr. Roney said if we agreed to this agreement there are huge obstacles to get timely approvals from the Bureau. On pending filming, Jack has been good at getting sign offs, in this instance there is no ground disturbance but these are things that will kill us. First filming company where Jack can't get a signature and it gets out and no one comes to Casitas to film, our revenue drops. Issues are beyond what policy and procedure say you have to do. Mr. Epperson said we met with state parks on something that will help you streamline that. We asked them to better define activities for things that would trigger environmental documentation. Mr. Roney said no approval needed from reclamation? There are too many mother may I's. Mr. Epperson said we are trying to replace with an exhibit that would raise the threshold before you have to come to us. Mr. Delamore added we have to streamline the process.

President Baggerly added while we have some real concerns on our part and we may take a shot at rewriting language you are also working on other segments that are not completed to make it work for Casitas. Mr. Epperson said that is correct. What you see may be harder nose than what the final may be. President Baggerly said there are archaic things such as rights for oil, drilling, and gas operations. Why is it in there? Mr. Collins said in case you discover gold. Mr. Epperson said it is a combination of formalities or boiler plate.

President Baggerly commented that we are not going to reach any conclusions here today. Mr. Delamore added we set some expectations today so that it does not languish. And we can decide the next course of action.

President Baggerly asked if they need time you need to finish your internal changes? Mr. Delamore said it would be most useful to get something back from Casitas on sections not acceptable and proposed changes. Mr. Epperson added we set a time frame around the first of March. Director Word said you would want this returned with our revisions? Mr. Epperson said yes and we will try to get our pieces back.

Casitas will get back to the Bureau the week of Feb 26<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Delamore said we won't have a constructive response to you. Director Word said you will get the idea of our concerns.

5. Discussion of recreation issues concerning:
  - a. Collection of fees and transferring them to Reclamation. Casitas is not to send the bureau any fees.
  - b. Wine Festival Agreement and the terms that the Reclamation requested. – clarify conditions that came up at the last meeting. Mr. Roney can proceed with wine festival agreement from 1 – 5 years. Mr. Delamore said there is no difference between 1 to 5 years. Mr. Roney explained the board wanted to proceed with a minimum of one year with maximum of five year. Business decisions to be made on a one year basis. They need to plan more than one year ahead.
  - c. New Concessionaire Agreements and the need to include terms and conditions for Reclamation. Mr. Roney explained that all of the agreements expire December 2008. We need to start the process of RFP to get that going. It is a large endeavor and that will be a ten year agreement. Director Word added there are business decisions to be made. Mr. Epperson said one of reason to get concepts in interim agreement. Mr. Roney said we will proceed as status quo. Mr. Delamore said through the interim agreement. Director Word pointed out that the interim agreement says as short as possible, no longer than two years. Mr. Epperson added part of what we are trying to do here would be the types of things anticipated over the long term. Change from interim to permanent would be minimal difference. Mr. Delamore added until you have a long term agreement there is that much uncertainty.
  - d. Other questions/comments

Mr. Epperson commented that they are putting together their request for the 2010 budget and would like to have your wish list for ADA and any justification. The deadline is May 15th.

6. Discussion of ADA issues. The projects that the District would like to propose if there is money for the work by Reclamation.

Deadline May 15th

7. Discussion regarding the Gas Company's easement work, the additional agreement by Reclamation.

Mr. Johnson said the response that we got was that they had an easement. My understanding is you put together a new agreement that gave them more area. Mr. Delamore said no, the existing easement predates ownership of our land. They needed

permission to travel across federal land. There was no discretionary action within that easement. They have the right to do what they need. Mrs. Baggerly asked if you are expanding the easement. Mr. Delamore said their original request included a request to expand but they are no longer pursuing it.

8. Discussion of concerns regarding filming permits.

We need immediate direction for filming with no ground disturbance; we will notify you but proceed. Jeep slated to start filming Wed. 31<sup>st</sup>. Jack is doing his best to get people to sign. There is no disturbance to the ground. This is the same as if the public came in and filmed something. If it is something different than we come to you and Jack gets it signed off. Mr. Delamore said we should write a letter stating that. Mr. Collins suggested establishing a baseline saying if impacts to this point go through steps, if no impact then just send a notice. If nothing more than cameras and filming a wedding or picnic or go to normal operation to move a boom or dock then that should be something that you don't require approval. Director word asked if they saw the area where the commercial was made. You can't see where it was made.

Mr. Roney asked where we stand with jeep commercial. Mr. Delamore said we could memorialize that with an informal communication of understanding of filming permits.

President Baggerly said the board is moving in that direction. Idea is that filming permits up to a certain threshold are ministerial not subject to CEQA and those types of parameters clearly laid out so simple things can be done, others need environmental review. Mr. Delamore added currently you are operating on federal land and taking action every day. Discover boating commercial was the same thing.

Mrs. Baggerly asked about trying to find the Bureau's NEPA guidelines. Are the revised and available for the public? Mr. Epperson said we found an older version and a draft. Mrs. Baggerly asked if he could e-mail me the older version and the draft. Mr. Delamore said we can give you the older version. He thought we may not have it electronically. Mr. Johnson suggested that Mr. Epperson send it to us have Rebekah scan in and can give to all of you. Mrs. Baggerly asked where is the hold up and what is the timeframe? Mr. Epperson replied it is done by the policy office in Denver.

9. Other issues  
None

President Baggerly adjourned the meeting at 2:02 p.m.

---

Secretary