



National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior

Pacific West
Regional Office
Oakland

1111 Jackson Street
Suite 700
Oakland, CA 94607
510-817-1300 phone
510-419-0197 fax

PACIFIC WEST REGIONAL OFFICE Memorandum

L7617 (PGSO-PP)

25 JUN 2010

Memorandum

To: Superintendent, Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area

From: Acting Regional Director, Pacific West Region

Subject: Environmental Compliance for Shoreline Management Plan

The *Finding of No Significant Impact* and the *Shoreline Management Plan* is approved. To complete this particular compliance effort, the park should provide notice of the decision to all individuals and organizations who received or commented on the supporting environmental assessment.


George J. Turnbull

Attachment

PACIFIC WEST REGIONAL OFFICE - DENVER, COLORADO

NOV 19 1981

TO: [Illegible]

FROM: [Illegible]

SUBJECT: [Illegible]

The following information is being provided to you for your information. This information is being provided to you for your information. This information is being provided to you for your information.

[Handwritten signature]

[Illegible]

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
Shoreline Management Plan
Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area
May 2010

Introduction

This Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) documents the decision of the National Park Service (NPS) to adopt the Shoreline Management Plan selected alternative and the determination that no significant impacts on the human environment are associated with that decision.

Project Background

The *Shoreline Management Plan* was intended to evaluate the need to modify visitor access opportunities along the shoreline, whether that access occurred from the lake or from land. Potential changes in management of the Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area shoreline are needed to accommodate visitors and fluctuating lake levels; to better protect natural and cultural resources; and to more effectively distribute visitor use.

The Lake Roosevelt *General Management Plan* (NPS 2000a) identified the need for a shoreline management plan. The *Shoreline Management Plan* is directly tiered from the *General Management Plan's* (NPS 2000a) call for continuing evaluation of shoreline management issues. Initial planning for the *Shoreline Management Plan* began in summer 2008 when NPS staff met to identify issues based on the GMP. Later Jones and Jones, Inc., a consultant team, was introduced to the park and began to study the effects of the proposed additional drawdown of the Lake by the State of Washington and Bureau of Reclamation and to assist in the *Shoreline Management Plan* process.

The *Shoreline Management Plan* Environmental Assessment included analysis of the need for additional or improved visitor facilities and other actions related to NPS management of the Lake Roosevelt shoreline called for by the Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area *General Management Plan* (NPS 2000a). The Cooperative Management Agreement or “five-party” agreement identifies the key responsibilities for the National Park Service, Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation and Spokane Tribe of Indians in managing Lake Roosevelt.

The *Shoreline Management Plan* does not address the vacation cabins located at Rickey Point or Sherman Creek. These vacation cabin sites, while located within the boundary of Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area, are being evaluated under separate environmental documents.

At full pool, the lake's surface elevation is 1,290 feet, with a surface area of approximately 81,389 acres and a shoreline of about 513 miles. The lake's width generally varies from 0.5 mile to 1.0 mile. The NPS manages 312 miles of the shoreline, 47,438 acres of water and 12,936 acres of land along the shore. NPS shoreline property varies from several feet adjacent to the high water line to approximately 0.5 mile. Seven miles of shoreline along the Kettle Falls arm and 29 miles of shoreline along the Spokane arm also make up part of the recreation area. Approximately 201 miles of shoreline is managed as part of the Colville Indian Reservation or the Spokane Indian Reservation with a much smaller portion managed by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Along the shoreline, the NPS currently manages 22 boat launch ramps. The boat ramps include adjacent vehicle and boat trailer parking. There are also 26 designated campgrounds (17 drive-in and 9 boat-in) with over 600 individual sites, swim beaches, and three concessioner-operated marinas, providing moorage, boat rental, fuel, supplies, sanitary facilities and other miscellaneous services.

Purpose and Need

Purpose: The National Park Service and its partners identified six key purposes for the Shoreline Management Plan:

1. Implement the provisions of the Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area *General Management Plan* (GMP) regarding shoreline management, including plans for day use visitor services at Crescent Bay (NPS 2000a:33).
2. Consistent with the GMP, analyze the adequacy of existing developments. Identify opportunities for expansion or construction of new facilities to/from the shoreline to accommodate current and future use and to distribute recreational use more evenly throughout the park (NPS 2000a:33 and 85).
3. Identify opportunities for increased consistency in shoreline management among the NPS, the tribes and other partner agencies and organizations.
4. As directed by the GMP, consider "more active methods for managing visitor use" that would improve management of and reduce impacts from day and overnight use and enhance the protection of natural cultural, and scenic resources (NPS 2000a:33).
5. Evaluate the Lake Roosevelt shoreline to determine whether it provides opportunities for new facilities where none now exist and initiate a process to guide potential future development and other management actions responsive to changing conditions.
6. Address fluctuating lake levels in facility and operational requirements to determine the effects of and plan for the proposed additional drawdown of Lake Roosevelt (by Washington State and the Bureau of Reclamation).

Need: Since publication of the GMP in 2000, additional housing development has occurred on private lands adjacent to the park. These private developments have resulted in increasing expectations/pressure on the park to provide shoreline (trail) access to the water and boat launch ramps, as well as additional community docks.

Existing public infrastructure, including shoreline access points and boat launch ramps, is becoming increasingly crowded and thus intermittently unavailable to visitors. At the same time, because of private development near the shoreline, visitors are confused about where they are welcome for boat-in day use and camping opportunities. The unregulated use of the Lake Roosevelt shoreline has also occasionally resulted in visitor conflicts due to crowding, including territoriality. Some visitors and area residents are concerned about what appears to be privatization of the Lake Roosevelt shoreline due to adjacent private development just outside the narrow strip of park shoreline, when in reality the lake shoreline is all in public or tribal ownership.

Where boat-in camping and day-use occur along the shoreline in informal sites, there are increasing concerns about potential human health hazards and resource impacts from the unlawful disposition of human waste, litter, illegal fires, and expansion of impacts from these areas inland.

Potential impacts from the State of Washington's proposal, now being evaluated by the State and Bureau of Reclamation, to draw down as much as an additional 1.8 feet of water from the lake primarily during the peak summer season will impact existing public and private recreational facilities and expose cultural resources to an unknown extent.

The park's visitor services staffing has decreased over time and has resulted in a limited ability to address problems that occur during the peak visitor use season. Visitor use areas are spread out over the length and breadth of the Lake and this dispersion makes them not only difficult to access, but difficult to monitor.

Changing visitation, coupled with changing visitor use patterns and the growing number of types and sizes of boats has resulted in an increasingly difficult management framework that lends itself to unresolved visitor use conflicts, increased resource impacts (e.g., looting of cultural resources), and the need to increase consistency in managing park uses.

There are inconsistent regulations, fees and permitting among the National Park Service, Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation and Spokane Tribe of the Indians managed areas of the park.

There is uneven coordination among the five counties responsible for overseeing private land development along the Lake Roosevelt shoreline. Limited enforcement of accepted land use practices has resulted in some confusion on the part of residents and visitors. There are opportunities for increasing coordination between the park and the counties with respect to zoning; setbacks; right-of-ways for residents, access and utilities; public access; potential easements; water procurement; and wastewater treatment.

Alternatives Analyzed

Four alternatives were analyzed in the Shoreline Management Plan. These alternatives included Alternative A: No Action (Continue Current Management), Alternative B (Preferred) (Visitor Use Management and Education), Alternative C (Partnerships and Agency Coordination), and Alternative D (Built Recreation Facilities).

Each alternative included strategies to address the major planning issues identified for the Shoreline Management Plan, including: improving public access to the shoreline, improving visitor use of the shoreline, increasing the recreational capacity of the lake, mitigating for proposed summer lake level changes, improving coordination among partners, managing shoreline natural and cultural resources, as well as enhancing public use and providing more information to visitors. Each alternative also addressed the GMP direction to provide a full-service marina and other facilities at Crescent Bay.

The alternatives were developed based on the purpose and need identified for the Shoreline Management Plan, including implementing GMP provisions, analyzing existing developments for potential expansion of existing or construction of new facilities, increasing consistency in shoreline management among the NPS, the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, the Spokane Tribes of the Spokane Reservation, and other partner agencies and organizations; considering more active methods for managing visitor use; initiating a process to guide potential future development; and addressing proposed additional fluctuation in lake levels.

Selected Alternative

Alternative B, the selected alternative would enhance visitor use and experience by changing recreation area management strategies to solve problems related to visitor use and resource impacts. New policies would influence user behavior and enhance resource protection.

Actions Common to All Alternatives: The selected alternative, like other alternatives, includes strategies to address the major planning issues: improving public access to the shoreline, improving visitor use of the shoreline, increasing the recreational capacity of the lake, mitigating for proposed summer lake level changes, improving coordination among partners, managing shoreline natural and cultural resources, as well as enhancing public use and providing more educational information to visitors. As with other alternatives, it also addressed the GMP direction to provide a full-service marina at Crescent Bay.

Elements Common to the Selected Alternative (Alternative B) and other Action Alternatives: The following "Common to All" actions include existing/ongoing management and maintenance actions, and actions identified for implementation in the 2000 *General Management Plan*. Actions that are common to

all alternatives that would also be part of the selected alternative include continuation of the community access point approval process; proposed construction of the Crescent Bay Marina; retention of the Tread Lightly© program and other strategies for managing human waste; retrofitting facilities to accommodate proposed lower lake levels in summer; existing agency and partnership coordination programs; existing native and non-native noxious weed management programs; and existing visitor interpretive and education programs. [A more detailed description of these is contained in *Actions Common to All Alternatives* (page 61-66) and Table III-1: *Summary of Actions Common to All Alternatives* in the *Shoreline Management Plan*].

Adaptive Management: As in *Actions Common to All*, the selected alternative would allow for monitoring and evaluation of visitor use to provide a basis to respond to changing resource conditions over time. Areas within Special Use Zones that have been dedicated for a specific use or group and where access to the general public is limited will be reviewed periodically to determine whether the continued use of those areas by private individuals or groups is inconsistent with the needs of the general public. This public needs assessment would summarize the status and trends associated with visitor use and demand for recreational opportunities that occur over time at Lake Roosevelt; in the general vicinity of each *General Management Plan* defined Special Use Zone. This public needs assessment will be informed by a set of qualitative social, cultural and natural resource information. Public need indicators and assessment methodology would be developed by the NPS in cooperation with academic and other expert input.

This periodic public needs assessment applies only to areas in special use management zones.

Public Access to the Shoreline: Primitive boat launches and docks would be evaluated using refined community access point (CAP) criteria. Non-compliant facilities would be removed. CAPs are designed to accommodate access to the lake from private land according to certain criteria regarding location and the provision of facilities where there is a willingness and ability to accommodate public use.

Primitive public CAPs (boat launches with public access and some available parking) existing before the reservoir (1942) would be grandfathered in. This would include an old road on the east side of Kamloops Island.

Public primitive boat launches would be developed at Moccasin Bay by the NPS but would remain unsigned due to their primitive and limited access. The existing non-compliant docks at Moccasin Bay and Sunset Point would be removed. The Moccasin Bay launch would be modified from that shown in the *Shoreline Management Plan* and would be moved south, away from adjacent residences. This would require additional site specific environmental analysis (an Environmental Assessment) following the completion of the *Shoreline Management Plan*.

New public buoy fields could be authorized and would extend the current 30-day limit for boat moorage on the lake. Private, unlawful buoys would continue to be removed. Boats could continue to be moored on the lake longer than 30-days at CAPs and marinas.

New shoreline trails would be created on existing linear landscape features, such as old irrigation ditches, roadbeds or levees. Those currently identified would include a trail between Bradbury Beach and Rickey Point along the historic irrigation ditch and a levee trail from the Kettle River Campground to Napoleon Bridge. Another shorter trail would be constructed from Crescent Bay to Spring Canyon.

Informal pedestrian access to the shoreline would continue where it does not have built features, such as stairs or rails. The NPS would work with communities to formalize, consolidate or remove neighborhood paths, using an expanded CAP process. In addition, the NPS would work with counties, developers and

communities to establish designated legal access points for new developments. Efforts would also be made to link non-adjacent communities to the shoreline.

Visitor Use of the Shoreline: Existing programs, such as Tread Lightly© and regulations, such as camping length of stay and campfire use, would continue.

User education would be enhanced through signage, pamphlets and visitor contacts with recreation area staff. Beach camping rules and regulations would be printed on permits. Permits and information would be available at kiosks, visitor centers and/or other appropriate locations outside the recreation area.

A permit system would be used for informal beach camping during the peak summer season. Permits would distribute campers to less impacted areas, manage boats mooring on buoys, and avoid sensitive areas. Sensitive areas are those that include rare, threatened or endangered species or important cultural resources. The permit system could help rangers monitor length of stay requirements and improve compliance with rules and regulations. Camping would be designated to regulate use in high demand areas to protect resource and improve visitor experience. Implementation of the permit system would be flexible to respond to changing conditions and to allow the system to be tested.

While informal reservation of shorelines for beach camping or day use by leaving personal property would continue to be prohibited, some designated boat-in campsites would be added to the reservation system for group camping. Among these could include Detillion and Penix Canyon.

New boat-in campgrounds could be designated, including at Neal Canyon between Plum Point and Keller Ferry, Cougar Cove, west of Ponderosa, and at Enterprise Bar, north of the Spokane Indian Reservation on the east side of the lake.

A walk-in camping zone with a permit system would be designated along Highway 25 between Jerome Point and Daisy, where road access is available for parking and the shoreline is accessible by foot. Parking would be coordinated with the county and the Washington Department of Transportation.

Trash and Human Waste Management: In addition to overnight boaters, day use boaters would be required to carry a portable toilet or some type of approved waste alleviation and gelling bag. The purpose of which is to provide a sanitary way to dispose of human waste when there is not a toilet available. Dispensers for waste bags and trash bags could be added at boat launches.

A vault toilet would be added upstream of Cayuse Cove on the Spokane Arm. The Kettle Falls area floating toilet would be moved closer to Rice. Other opportunities to add floating toilets would be identified and the operating season for floating toilets would be extended, pending funding and staffing.

In addition, the NPS would add the following strategy from Alternative D to the selected alternative: Establish additional toilets along the shore and at boat-in campsites. Provide toilets at new boat-in campsites visible from or with signage from the water.

Noise: Existing noise limits would continue, however increased training and enforcement would occur. There would also be increased coordination with the tribes to adopt and enforce consistent noise pollution regulations.

Beach Fires: In cooperation with the Washington Department of Natural Resources and counties, fire bans would continue to be enforced. In addition, the NPS would continue to coordinate with the DNR and counties for fire bans, however the current compendium would be amended to allow beach fires year-

round on exposed beaches (when the fire danger rating is at or below Level 2). Fire safety education would be enhanced and spot patrols would be increased.

Capacity of Facilities: Visitor communication regarding facility availability would be expanded. Electronic message boards could be added along incoming highways and radio or web-based communications would be added or expanded. The recreation area map would be revised to show tribal boat launches and other facilities. Improved signage on public docks would indicate length of stay requirements and area rules and regulations.

A new deepwater boat launch would be added on the north end of the lake to expand use and to compensate for when the lake level is too low to launch at Kettle Falls. This action would be slightly modified from that proposed in the Shoreline Management Plan. In addition to the potential site at Rickey Point, other sites such as Matney Mill and near Nancy Creek would also be evaluated through additional environmental analysis (an Environmental Assessment). The size and demand for parking and other day use accommodations, such as picnicking would also be evaluated.

Day use and overnight parking would also be expanded at Crescent Bay, Fort Spokane, Keller Ferry, Gifford, Lincoln and Porcupine Bay. Additional parking would occur in existing disturbed areas within low-impact gravel lots, subject to additional environmental analysis.

Lower Lake Levels in Summer: There would be increased public communication about lake levels regulated by the Bureau of Reclamation (BOR). Launch ramps, docks and log booms would be retrofitted on a priority-identified basis to accommodate the additional drawdown of the lake proposed by the BOR and the State of Washington.

Swim Areas: Ongoing programs would continue. In addition, water circulation at the Kettle Falls swim area could be increased or this and the Marcus Island swim area could potentially be moved, requiring additional environmental analysis.

Agency Coordination: Interagency communication would be maintained via the Five-party Agreement, the Lake Roosevelt Forum and ongoing partnerships with the surrounding counties and local governments. Memoranda of Understanding with the counties would be updated. A comparison of differences among agency, tribal and county regulations would continue to be published in the park newsletter.

The NPS would evaluate opportunities for improved coordination and additional collaboration with local, state and federal agency partners. A toll-free phone line could be established to direct inquiries to the appropriate agency. A reciprocal system of notification among the NPS and local governments would be established to improve communication about changes to lake / shoreline policies and regulations.

In addition, the following strategy from Alternative C would be added to the selected alternative: "Explore opportunities for greater collaboration with the tribes related to beach camping, permits and fees."

While the plan calls for additional agency coordination, it does not include actions that would affect tribal management.

Natural Resources: Ongoing native and non-native vegetation management programs would continue. Aquatic vegetation management would allow for control of both native and non-native species in priority areas and the NPS would continue to coordinate with state and county weed boards and adjacent landowners to control noxious upland weeds.

In addition, improvements to existing aquatic vegetation management would occur from establishing vegetation management zones, increased coordination with neighbors and partners and increased educational strategies. High use visitor facilities (boat launches and swim areas) could have increased management, while low use areas could have less intensive management. Information about native and non-native aquatic vegetation would be distributed and the NPS would nurture long-term relationships with neighbors through cooperative work parties, shoreline monitoring and other collaborative resource management programs.

Visitor Education and Information: NPS staff would continue to focus on a resource protection message in visitor contacts and to encourage neighborhood clean-up programs and stewardship grounds.

In addition to increased signs along incoming highways and radio and web-based information, the NPS would incorporate additional public information and education strategies targeted at adjacent landowners. *The River Mile* school program would continue, *Tread Lightly*© would be expanded, and a "Welcome Neighbor" brochure published to inform adjacent landowners of park rules and regulations. Adjacent landowners would also be encouraged to participate in established ecological habitat programs, such as for backyard wildlife habitat, and to assist the recreation area in monitoring for noise, littering or illegal activities. A "Lake Roosevelt Partner" program could also be established for neighbors meeting certain requirements.

Crescent Bay: The SMP contains a Development Concept Plan (DCP) for the Crescent Bay area, defining its purpose as follows: "This Development Concept Plan proposes a full-service marina and supporting recreational facilities. The plan drawings for the marina and other concession facilities are conceptual to allow flexibility for partnering with private concession operators. Future studies or plans for Crescent Bay may include a concessions plan and prospectus, detailed NPS-facility design plans for the interpretive facilities, and detailed design plans submitted by the concessionaire for the full-service marina." The DCP also contains a fairly detailed description of these components and their probable locations at Crescent Bay.

In addition to a full-service marina, new educational / interpretive facilities would be added at Crescent Bay. These could include interpretive exhibits, a small visitor contact station, and a classroom / multi-use space for school programs. The day use area would be formalized and expanded to improve the swim area and picnicking. In addition, a small primitive campground would be constructed with drive-in and walk-in areas. In response to comments, the campground could also include a small group camping area. Area parking and circulation would be reconfigured and disturbed areas would be restored with native vegetation. Designated nature trails would link site features and connect to the proposed trail to Spring Canyon.

Relationship to the General Management Plan: The addition of the Spokane Arm facilities constitutes an amendment to the *General Management Plan*. A primitive, public boat launch at Moccasin Bay and Corkscrew, a toilet east of Cayuse Cove, and an additional boat-in campground at Cougar Cove on the Spokane Arm would be added to accommodate existing use and improve resource conditions.

Changes from Alternative B in the Shoreline Management Plan

As noted above (see Public Access to the Shoreline, Capacity of Facilities and Agency Coordination), there were several modifications to the Shoreline Management Plan based on public comments. These include additional future environmental analysis associated with the proposed Moccasin Bay and Rickey Point facilities and for the proposed expansion of parking areas. In addition, the selected alternative would include a provision from Alternative C regarding increased agency coordination and another provision from Alternative D regarding the establishment of additional toilets.

Summary of Other Alternatives Considered

Three other alternatives were considered in the *Shoreline Management Plan* Environmental Assessment: Alternatives A, C and D.

Alternative A: No Action: Continue to manage Lake Roosevelt under existing funding levels, as directed by the General Management Plan.

In Alternative A, the National Park Service would continue current management actions, including current maintenance, staffing, programs and regulations which form the existing management of Lake Roosevelt. Under this alternative, management actions would continue to implement the General Management Plan under existing funding levels. Ongoing maintenance, patrol levels, coordination with other agencies, and development of proposed facilities would remain the same.

Alternative C: Enhance the Lake Roosevelt visitor experience through an emphasis on expanded partnerships and interagency coordination. Coordination with managing agencies outlined in the Selected Alternative would increase regulatory consistency lake-wide, and better highlight any differences in boating and camping regulations. Reciprocal agreements between the agencies is also called for in the Selected Alternative, these agreements would simplify payment and permit applications between these agencies.

Under Alternative C, the National Park Service would continue to work closely with its current shoreline management partners while expanding its coordination efforts with other government agencies, non-profit groups and neighboring communities to achieve a cooperatively managed lake shoreline. This alternative would emphasize the multi-jurisdictional management of the Lake Roosevelt watershed, and the comprehensive nature of the problems facing that watershed which lend themselves to innovative multi-jurisdictional solutions.

Alternative D: Enhance the Lake Roosevelt visitor experience through an emphasis on upgrades and expansion of park facilities and infrastructure as well as the construction of new facilities.

In Alternative D, the National Park Service would enhance public access and enjoyment of Lake Roosevelt by constructing new facilities, upgrading or expanding existing facilities, and making other targeted improvements to the recreation area. Alternative D would increase recreational facility capacity, including the number of boat launches, trails, car and boat-in campgrounds, public buoys and docks. Improved recreational facility capacity would address problems associated with crowding on busy summer weekends as well as future lake level draw-downs.

Preliminary Alternatives Considered But Dismissed

Under NEPA, an alternative may be eliminated from detailed study for the following reasons [40 CFR 1504.14 (a)]:

- Technical or economic infeasibility;
- Inability to meet project objectives or resolve need for the project;
- Duplication of other less environmentally damaging alternatives;
- Conflicts with an up-to-date valid plan, statement of purpose and significance, or other policy; and therefore, would require a major change in that plan or policy to implement; and
- Environmental impacts not acceptable.

The following alternatives or variations were considered during the design phase of the project, but because they met one or more of the above criteria, they were rejected.

Allow Boats Mooring Anywhere on the Lake for Longer than 30 Days: Boats may currently moor on Lake Roosevelt for a maximum of 30 days under certain conditions. Expansion of this mooring limit is proposed in Alts B and D and is currently occurring under CAPs; however, unlimited locations for boat mooring would lead to safety problems from increased hazards to navigation, and is therefore not considered in this plan.

Establish a Permit System for Mooring Boats: A lake-wide permit system was proposed to allow boaters greater flexibility in mooring their boats for longer periods. Permits could be issued for different time periods (i.e. 30 days, 60 days and 90 days) depending on need. This action was dismissed because enforcing multiple permit types throughout Lake Roosevelt was not feasible even with an increase in staffing. It would also encourage more boats to moor up and down the shoreline, causing navigation hazards and limiting the public use of that shoreline. This action was dismissed because alternatives with fewer adverse impacts were incorporated into the plan.

Teel Flats Drive-in and Boat-in Campground: To provide additional opportunities to boaters and reduce impacts to beaches from informal beach camping, a new boat-in campground was proposed at Teel Flats on the southern shore of the Spokane Arm. Increased boat traffic in this area of the Spokane Arm runs counter to the land use goals of the Spokane Tribe. This action was dismissed because it would have increased adverse effects and require more changes to the GMP.

Land-Based Dump Station: A dump station was proposed between Hunters and Daisy to increase the capacity of the shoreline to accommodate wastewater from boats exiting the water. This action was rejected because it would be expensive to install and maintain in an area and because there was not a demonstrated need for wastewater dumping at this location.

Jurisdictional Signs on the Lake: Because the lake is governed by the NPS and the tribes, some visitors are confused about different policies and regulations and where they apply. Floating signs were proposed to identify jurisdictional boundaries. This action however was dismissed because floating signs would visually detract from the natural lake environs, increase maintenance costs and minimize the on-going efforts to manage the lake under agency partnerships.

Crescent Bay Facility Enhancements: The boat launch at Crescent Bay currently ends at the 1265 foot elevation level. A lower (extended) launch would increase the boat launching season at Crescent Bay. At the end of the existing ramp, the slope steepens, requiring a large amount of stable fill before a launch ramp extension could be constructed. This action was dismissed because of the expense and the difficult topographic conditions. A new playground and Crescent Lake boat launch were also rejected due to a lack of need for these facilities and the quiet nature of the lake-side environs.

Environmentally Preferable Alternative

In accordance with NPS Director's Order 12, Conservation Planning, Environmental Impact Analysis and Decision-making, the NPS is required to identify the environmentally preferred alternative in environmental documents.

The environmentally preferred alternative is determined by applying the criteria suggested in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, which is guided by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). The CEQ (46 FR 18026 – 46 FR 18038) provides direction that “the environmentally preferable alternative is the alternative that will promote the national environmental policy as expressed in NEPA’s Section 101 (b)”, which considers:

1. Fulfilling the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations;

2. Assuring for all generations safe, healthful, productive, and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings;
3. Attaining the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk of health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences;
4. Preserving important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage and maintaining, wherever possible, an environment that supports diversity and variety of individual choice;
5. Achieving balance between population and resource use that will permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities, and
6. Enhancing the quality of renewable resources and approaching the maximum attainable recycling of depleted resources.

The environmentally preferred alternative is "the alternative that causes the least damage to the biological and physical environment; it also means the alternative which best protects, preserves, and enhances historic, cultural, and natural resources (46 FR 18026 – 46 FR 18038). According to NPS NEPA Handbook (DO-12), through identification of the environmentally preferred alternative, the NPS decision-makers and the public are faced with the relative merits of choices and must clearly state through the decision-making process the values and policies used in reaching final decisions.

Under Alternative A (No Action / Continue Current Management), natural and cultural resources would continue to be protected and preserved according to current policies and regulations. Alternative A satisfies the CEQ criteria 1, 4 and 6.

Current park strategies promote caring for the environment for future generations, preserving historic, cultural and natural aspects of the environment and enhancing and recycling renewable resources. Although Alternative A may satisfy certain aspects of CEQ criteria 2 and 3, it does not adequately address the health, aesthetic and safety concerns of crowded informal beach camping, such as human waste on the beach and trash. Some boating and camping is causing trash and human waste problems during the busy summer months. Alternative A also does not fully satisfy Criteria 5, balancing standards of living with resource use, because of uncontrolled beach impacts and facility use levels.

Implementation of Alternative B or C would directly address the CEQ criteria by enhancing communication with partnering agencies, implementing a lake-wide permit system, and installing new facilities that enhance visitor experience (quality of life) at the lake. Both alternatives also have similar negligible to moderate adverse impacts to land use, air quality, water quality and special status species.

The two alternatives differ in several substantive ways. Alternative B proposes public buoy fields, boat-in campgrounds and a toilet east of Cayuse Cove not included in Alternative C. These facilities would add to the range of visitor amenities offered on Lake Roosevelt and solve current management problems. The buoy fields would consolidate moorage on the lake, increasing the scenic quality of the shoreline and enhancing navigation. In a similar way, additional boat-in campgrounds would focus visitor impacts to a few areas. A toilet east of Cayuse Cove has modest impacts to soils and vegetation, but improved access to restroom facilities by boaters will likely improve beach cleanliness and water quality. Alternative C proposed additional cooperation with partnering agencies, organizations and local governments. While this could likely have a strong influence on improving lake-wide management strategies and implementation, its effects on the natural, cultural and scenic environment cannot currently be predicted with certainty because additional specific actions related to it would be developed over time with partners.

Implementation of Alternative D would include many of the same actions found in B and C, but without the lake-wide permit system. Without the permit system, the NPS would not have adequate control over visitor use of certain highly impacted areas. A permit system would encourage the distribution of visitors

to less sensitive parts of the lake, while making it more feasible for park rangers to ensure visitor and resource protection. Alternative D has a few more proposed facilities, such as a walk-in campground and day use area at Jerome Point, additional toilets along the shoreline, and expanded docks. These facilities, while designed to improve the visitor experience and health of the visitor, would have additional adverse effects over Alternatives B or C.

The Crescent Bay Development was also considered in determining the environmentally preferred alternative. All four alternatives would have similar adverse and beneficial effects. All four would include a concessionaire constructed and operated full-service marina at Crescent Bay. Alternative A would have the fewest adverse impacts related to development, but because it would not include restoration would also continue to allow the area to remain disturbed with few visitor amenities. Alternatives B and C would include a small campground, a different trail configuration and an education center. Alternative D would include slightly less development at Crescent Bay, but similar amounts of landscape restoration. Both would include an enhanced swimming area and interpretation.

Overall the combination of facilities in Alternatives B and C would better enhance visitor facilities and resource education leading to a better balance of resource uses that would contribute to a better visitor experience and additional enhancement of park resources. Therefore, Alternative B is the environmentally preferred alternative. This alternative best addresses the six CEQ criteria. Alternative B strategies would improve the recreation area, making it a better place for future generations of visitors. It encourages the clean-up of Lake Roosevelt beaches and campgrounds through management actions, resulting in improvements to the health, safety and scenery of the lake. It would allow for greater, but more controlled, recreational use, without degradation of environmental resources. It would preserve important historic, cultural and natural aspects of the shoreline. It would balance human activities and opportunities for recreation with the sensitive resources of the recreation area. And it would enhance the quality of park resources by preserving and restoring the shoreline landscape.

Endangered Species Act

Federal agencies must consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) to ensure their actions will not jeopardize the continued existence of any federally listed or proposed threatened or endangered species, or designated or proposed critical habitat [ESA, Sec. 7 (a) (2), 16 USC 1531 et seq.]. If listed species are present, the Federal agency must determine if the action will have *no effect*, *may affect*, [but is] *not likely to adversely affect* or *may affect, likely to adversely affect* those species. The NPS made the determination of effect for the Selected Alternative following guidance outlined in the *Endangered Species Act Consultation Handbook: Procedures for Conducting Section 7 Consultations and Conferences* (1998 USFWS and National Marine Fisheries Service). NPS has determined that the Selected Alternative will have "no effect" on any federally listed, candidate or proposed species or their designated critical habitat.

National Historic Preservation Act

To avoid a significant effect on cultural resources, separate Section 106 compliance will be undertaken for each action that results from this plan. The NPS will make the determination of effect on historic properties pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) in accordance with the *NPS Programmatic Agreement*. For the purpose of NEPA and NPS policy, an impact to a historic property that is eligible or listed under the National Register of Historic Places would be considered significant if an adverse affect could not be resolved through agreement with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), American Indian tribal governments, or other consulting and interested parties and the public. The NPS intends to avoid impacts to cultural resources through consultation with all interested parties to ensure that implementation of the plan has *no adverse effect* on historic properties or American Indian traditional cultural properties, (36

CFR Part 800.5). Therefore, the Selected Alternative will not have a significant effect on historic properties.

Why the Selected Alternative Will Not Have a Significant Effect

The NPS has determined that the Selected Alternative can be implemented with no significant adverse effects on soils, water quality, vegetation, wildlife, special status species, prehistoric and historical archeology, ethnographic resources, historic structures and cultural landscapes, visitor experience, or park operations. NEPA requires that decision-making regarding the analysis of significance be based on analysis of the proposed action with respect to the following factors:

- The Selected Alternative has a wide range of beneficial and adverse effects (see Measures to Minimize Environmental Harm below).
- The Selected Alternative will not adversely affect public health or safety.
- The Selected Alternative will not impact the unique characteristics of the area, including prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers or ecologically critical areas.
- The effects on the human environment are known, and there were no controversial impacts or aspects of the proposed project that surfaced during the environmental analysis process.
- The Selected Alternative neither establishes an NPS precedent for future actions with significant effects, nor represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.
- The Selected Alternative will have *no adverse effect* on contributing features to these historic properties.
- The proposed project would have no effect on species listed or proposed for listing.
- No significant cumulative effects and no highly uncertain, unique or unknown risks were identified during preparation of the EA or during the public review period.
- The Selected Alternative will not violate any federal, state or local environmental protection laws.

Non-Impairment of Park Resources

Pursuant to the 1916 Organic Act, the National Park Service has a management responsibility “to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of future generations.” Therefore, the National Park Service cannot take an action that would “impair” park resources or values.

Based on the analysis provided in the *Shoreline Management Plan Environmental Assessment*, the National Park Service concludes that implementation of the selected alternative (Alternative B with slight modifications) would have no major adverse impacts to a resource or value whose conservation is (1) necessary to fulfill specific purpose and significance of Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area; (2) key to the natural or cultural integrity of Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area or to opportunities for enjoyment of the recreation area; or (3) identified as a goal in the General Management Plan or other relevant National Park Service planning documents. Consequently, implementation of the proposed action will not violate the National Park Service Organic Act.

Measures to Minimize Environmental Harm

The following summary identifies the impacts and mitigation required for satisfactory implementation of the selected alternative. This summary assigns responsibility for ensuring the measures which minimize, eliminate or avoid these impacts are implemented.

All mitigation measures described in this section will be implemented. Further mitigation measures may be developed in response to ongoing formal and informal consultation on this project and may also augment the measures described below. The measures identified below are designed to ensure that

impacts to park natural and cultural resources, visitor use/experience and park operations are avoided, minimized or mitigated.

Measures to Minimize Environmental Harm

Resource	Impact	Measures to Avoid, Minimize or Mitigate Impacts	Responsibility
Land Use	Localized moderate adverse effects from new facilities in new locations (boat launches, toilets, etc.) and expanded or modified facilities in existing locations (parking, boat launches, and boat-in camping).	See below	Maintenance Division Resource Management and Education Division Contracting Officers Representative
Measures to Avoid, Minimize or Mitigate Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New areas of development would be the minimum needed to accommodate proposed activities. • Development footprints would be concentrated, rather than spread out. • Construction limits would be clearly delineated to prevent expansion of construction operations into undisturbed areas. 		
Air Quality	<p>Short-term impacts to air quality from dust and exhaust. Increased dust from expanded gravel parking areas. Increased smoke from campfires allowed year-round in designated areas.</p> <p>Beneficial impacts from access to facilities within closer driving distance and from designated zone-based boat-in camping.</p>	See below	Maintenance Division Resource Management and Education Division Contracting Officers Representative
Measures to Avoid, Minimize or Mitigate Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spraying water over exposed soil, particularly during dry conditions to minimize fugitive dust. • Covering trucks transporting cut or fill material to reduce or eliminate particle release during transport. • Encouraging contractor and NPS employees to travel together to and from the project site to the extent possible (rather than in multiple separate vehicles). • Revegetating bare and staging areas as soon as possible. • Minimizing the extent of vegetation removal associated with construction activities. • Encouraging the use of local labor sources and large-volume material delivery to minimize trip generation during construction activity. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Using propane and solar devices for heating. • Using low VOC paints, solvents and other chemicals in building construction. • Restricting idling of construction vehicles and equipment to no longer than 15 minutes when not in use. • Using biodiesel rather than traditional diesel fuel. • Have flagger request that non-work vehicles be turned off if delays are longer than 5 minutes to reduce air pollution until traffic flow resumes. 		
Soils and Vegetation	<p>Ongoing impacts from existing operations plus additional effects from controlling native and non-native aquatic vegetation, constructing additional designated boat-in campsites, overflow parking, trails and other facilities, including new and expanded facilities.</p> <p>Beneficial impacts from restoration, particularly in the Crescent Bay area and from improved education strategies.</p>	See below.	Resource Management and Education Division Contracting Officers Representative
Measures to Avoid, Minimize or Mitigate Impacts	<p>Soils</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locating staging areas where they will minimize new disturbance of area soils and vegetation. • Minimizing ground disturbance to the extent possible. • Avoiding precipitation times during construction. • Minimizing driving over or compacting root-zones and using mats or plywood to minimize soil compaction impacts in sensitive areas. • Salvaging topsoil from excavated areas for use in re-covering source area or other project areas. • Not piling excavated soil alongside trees to remain, and providing tree protection for trees to remain. • Windrowing topsoil at a height that will help to preserve soil microorganisms (less than three feet). • Reusing (rather than removing) excavated materials from the project area. • Revegetating project areas through native seeding and/or planting. • Importing weed-free clean fill and topsoil. • Delineating clearing limits to minimize the amount of vegetation loss. • Clearing and grubbing only those areas where construction would occur. • Installing silt fencing or other erosion control methods, to prevent loss of native soil. 		

	<p>Vegetation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Driving only on established roads and trails away from weed infested areas. • Removing seeds from vehicles and equipment. • Not driving recreation vessels through Eurasian water milfoil mats. • Preventing the spread of Eurasian water milfoil by removing plant fragments from boat props, trailers, fishing lines, etc. • Salvaging native plant material prior to construction and re-planting it afterwards. 		
<p>Water Resources: Water Quality</p>	<p>Ongoing impacts from existing operations. Improved water quality from requirement for day use boaters to carry portable toilets, increasing fixed and floating toilets, and from better understanding of water quality impacts.</p>	<p>See below</p>	<p>Resource Management and Education Division Contracting Officers Representative</p>
<p>Measures to Avoid, Minimize or Mitigate Impacts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Establishing a long-term repeatable water quality monitoring program to detect undesirable effects on water quality. • Using the water quality monitoring program to mitigate detectable adverse effects on water quality. • Increasing the number of toilets within the recreation area. • Implementing the provision to require day use as well as overnight boaters to carry portable toilets. • Educating recreation area visitors about potential impacts to water quality from improperly disposed of human waste. • Continuing to monitor study results from the industrial plant contamination on the Canadian border to implement any future recommendations. • Adding runoff barriers to paved parking areas where possible to reduce contamination from petroleum products. • Gradually incorporating new boating technology to reduce unspent fuel contamination in the park's administrative operations fleet. • Considering a requirement for marinas to have self-contained wash-bays to prevent pollution runoff contamination within the lake. • Delineating staging areas away from the lake and marking them to prevent incremental expansion. • Covering stockpiled soil and rock throughout the duration of the project with a breathable, water repellent fabric anchored around the perimeter to minimize sedimentation. • Minimizing the amount of disturbed earth area and the duration of soil exposure to rainfall. • Minimizing soil disturbance and re-seeding or revegetating disturbed areas as soon as practical. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retaining silt fencing in disturbed areas until stabilization (by reseeded or revegetation). • Installing protective construction fencing around, adjacent to or near wetland and/or riparian areas that are to be protected or other erosion control measures to protect water resources in the project area. • Using vegetable based hydraulic fluid and biodiesel in heavy equipment, when possible. • Paving (creation of impervious surface) would also be minimized. • Requiring and approving an Oil and Hazardous Materials Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Plan to address hazardous materials storage, spill prevention and response before construction begins. 		
Wildlife	<p>Short-term noise and activity during construction. Ongoing long-term noise and activity from recreational activities. Some long-term minor loss of habitat associated with new facilities in new areas.</p> <p>Beneficial impacts from restoration of some habitat.</p>	See below	Resource Management and Education Division Contracting Officers Representative
Measures to Avoid, Minimize or Mitigate Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheduling construction activities with seasonal consideration of wildlife • lifecycles to minimize impacts during sensitive periods (i.e., bird nesting and breeding seasons, periods of bat breeding, rearing and hibernating, etc). • Minimizing the degree of habitat removal (clearing) by clearly delineating construction limits. • Limiting the effects of light and noise on wildlife habitat through controls on construction equipment and timing of construction activities, such as limiting construction to daylight hours. • Maintaining routes of escape for animals that might fall into excavated pits and trenches. During construction activities, Contractor personnel would maintain vigilance for animals caught in excavations and take appropriate action to free them. • Ensuring that spill prevention measures are in place to prevent inadvertent spills of fuel, oil, hydraulic fluid, antifreeze, and other toxic chemicals that could affect wildlife. • Discouraging construction personnel at work sites from providing a source of • human food to wildlife, avoiding conditioning of wildlife and in human/wildlife conflicts. • Maintaining proper food storage, disposing of all food waste and food-related waste promptly, in a bear-proof receptacle, if available and removing all garbage off-site at the end of each working day. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using sediment traps and other water quality protection measures around new parking areas to minimize the effects of runoff contaminated with petroleum products from vehicle use. 		
Special Status Species	No effect on any species listed as threatened or endangered or a candidate for such listing.	See below	Resource Management and Education Division
Measures to Avoid, Minimize or Mitigate Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continuing to conduct additional site specific surveys for special status plants and wildlife prior to actual implementation of project actions, where warranted, and as specific project implementation details are developed. 		
Cultural Resources (including archeological resources, ethnography and historic structures)	Individual Projects would avoid all archeological or ethnographic resources considered eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places as defined in 36 CFR 60.	See below	Resource Management and Education Division Contracting Officers Representative
Measures to Avoid, Minimize or Mitigate Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Separate Section 106 analysis would be undertaken for each proposed action that has the potential to affect cultural resources. Proposed actions would be designed to avoid cultural resources considered eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places and cultural resources applicable to AIRFA, NAGPRA and Executive Order 13007: Indian Sacred Sites. Notifying the park archaeologist of the specific work schedule prior to staging and construction to have the opportunity to conduct any test excavation surveys prior to ground disturbance. Stopping work in the area of identification and nearby areas if archeological resources are discovered at any point during the project work, as directed by the park until the find could be evaluated and action taken to avoid or mitigate the impact. When it is necessary to stop work due to archeological resources discovery, the contractor would cease all activities in the area of discovery; allow the archeologist to complete investigations; and take measures to protect the resources discovered as directed by the park. Avoiding further impact by modifying project implementation as needed at the site if archeological resources are discovered during implementation. If this is not possible, as much information as possible would be collected about the site in accordance with applicable laws and regulations and additional consultation with applicable agencies and tribes would occur as specified in the implementing regulations for Section 106 of the NHPA. Monitoring ground disturbing actions as appropriate during construction to ascertain presence/absence of archeological materials within the proposed construction zone. Monitoring would be focused where buried historical deposits might be present beneath existing development. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determining if a monitoring plan is needed to detail the final construction plans, the cultural material that might be encountered, important archeological questions that could be addressed, and a range of treatment options (e.g., avoidance, data recovery) for any findings. • Evaluating the eligibility of the site as a whole under National Register of • Historic Places Criteria If monitoring results in the discovery of important materials. • Following procedures outlined in the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act in the unlikely event that human remains or any objects protected under NAGPRA are exposed. This would include the potential need to stop work for a minimum of 30 calendar days. During that time, work may resume in non-sensitive areas. 		
Visitor Experience (Visitor Access, Opportunities and Safety)	Improved visitor access to designated boat-in camping. Improved visitor use opportunities from new interpretive and access trails, walk-in and overnight camping, public buoy fields, new community access points, etc. New educational opportunities at Crescent Bay. More visitor services information provided at more places.		Resource Management and Education Division Law Enforcement Division Contracting Officers Representative
Measures to Avoid, Minimize or Mitigate Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoiding evening, weekend and holiday work by requiring approval from the superintendent. Longer construction delays or total road closures may also require approval from the superintendent. • Conducting materials deliveries (to the degree possible) in the early morning and late evening hours. • Distributing press releases to local media, signs in the recreation area and ferry information to inform visitors about construction conditions during the projects. • Scheduling work around high visitor use days and times, such as holidays and weekends. • Developing a safety plan prior to the initiation of construction to ensure the safety of recreation area visitors, workers, neighbors, and park staff. • Controlling dust during construction (by minimizing soil disturbance, spraying water but no chemicals over disturbed soil areas during dry periods and revegetating disturbed soil areas as soon as practical following construction). 		
Scenic Resources	Short- and long-term negligible to minor	See below	Resource Management and Education Division

	adverse impacts from new and expanded facilities. Long-term beneficial effects from cooperation with counties.		Law Enforcement Division
Measures to Avoid, Minimize or Mitigate Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New structures, including signs, buildings and other facilities would be designed to fit into the existing vernacular landscape, including associated colors, textures and styles. • New structures would be concealed from major viewpoints as much as possible. • Additional cooperation with county land use planning departments for shoreline access and for mitigating the effects of boundary development along the recreation area would occur. 		
Soundscape	Long-term minor to moderate beneficial effects from working with tribes to manage excessive boat noise.	See below	Resource Management and Education Division Contracting Officers Representative
Measures to Avoid, Minimize or Mitigate Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimizing construction activities during normally quiet or sensitive times of day, such as during the morning, evening and at night. • Considering changing the nature and scope of special use permits for cigar boat races and other special events if these events became more frequent or use of the boats more widespread. • Have flagger request non-work idling vehicles to reduce noise pollution if delays will be more than five minutes until traffic flow resumes. 		
Socioeconomics	Short-term minor to moderate beneficial impacts from construction. Long-term minor beneficial impacts from improved facilities.		Resource Management and Education Division Maintenance Division
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where possible projects would be combined or phased to allow for cost savings measures related to staging remaining in place rather than setting up and taking down for sequential implementation actions. • New facilities would be constructed according to LEED standards to minimize long-term operations costs. • New buildings, facilities and other improvements would be constructed from recycled and reused materials to the extent possible. 		
Park Operations		Same as above	Same as above

Public Involvement

Internal scoping is the effort to engage professional staff of Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area and other NPS offices (Pacific West Region and Denver Service Center) to provide information regarding proposed actions that may affect park resources. Internal scoping, which began in February 2008, was also formally conducted. A variety of concerns were identified from park staff in vegetation, wildlife, maintenance, water resources, and planning through participation in an internal scoping meeting held on February 26–29, 2008 and another meeting with Jones & Jones staff in March. Comments were also solicited formally and informally from Interdisciplinary Planning Team members and from other agency staff. The initial Interdisciplinary Planning Team meeting occurred on August 12, 2008. Later Interdisciplinary Planning Team meetings occurred in December 2008 and April 2009. Internal scoping continued throughout the development of this EA.

As a key step in the overall conservation planning and environmental impact analysis process necessary for achieving the goal of managing the Lake Roosevelt shoreline, the NPS sought public comments and relevant information to guide the preparation of the EA. Among the objectives of this public scoping were to:

- Invite participation from federal, tribal, state, local governments and other interested parties;
- Inform all interested parties about the scope of the problem and the need to find solutions;
- Identify a preliminary range of management alternatives (in addition to a no action alternative that will be used as a baseline of existing conditions from which to evaluate proposed changes in management);
- Identify substantive environmental (including natural, cultural, recreational and socioeconomic) issues which warrant detailed environmental impact analysis, and eliminate issues or topics which do not require analysis;
- Identify potential environmental consequences and suitable mitigation strategies.

Public scoping was occurred through the following means: 1) a press release describing the intent to begin the public involvement process through comments on the proposed project was mailed to news media on August 14, 2008; 2) a newsletter was distributed to approximately 350 people on the park's mailing list and was available at Lake Roosevelt NRA headquarters in Coulee Dam; and 3) it was announced on the NPS's Planning, Environment and Public Comment (PEPC) website on August 19, 2008.

The public outreach called for by Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act NHPA was integrated into the NEPA process in accordance with the *NPS Programmatic Agreement and Management Policies* (2006).

An Interdisciplinary Planning Team comprised of NPS representatives from the recreation area and from the Pacific West Region, and invited representatives from three adjacent counties (Ferry, Lincoln and Stevens), the Bureau of Reclamation, the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, the Spokane Tribe of Indians, and an independent consultant (Jones & Jones, Ltd.) led the planning process.

Public scoping for the plan was announced in June 2008 in the park newspaper and via a newsletter and press release mailed in August 2008 to approximately 350 park neighbors, partners and visitors on the mailing list to notify them of the upcoming public scoping meetings.

The formal public scoping period for the Lake Roosevelt Shoreline Management Plan began on August 14, 2008 and ended on September 30, 2008. During this time, Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area held four open house public meetings in Colville (September 8, 2008), Coulee Dam (September 9, 2008), Davenport (September 10, 2008) and Spokane (September 11, 2008). Those with concerns or information about management issues to be addressed in the planning process were strongly encouraged to submit verbal and/or written comments. Professional staff from the Interdisciplinary Team introduced

the project, gave presentations, answered questions, and accepted comments. The meetings were attended by approximately 137 people. There were 55 people who signed in at the Colville public meeting, 15 people who signed in at the Coulee Dam Public Meeting, 34 people who signed in at the Davenport Public Meeting, and 33 people who signed in at the Spokane Public Meeting. Overall, more than 200 comments were recorded by NPS and Jones & Jones staff at these meetings.

In December 2008, another newsletter was mailed to describe the results of public scoping. An April 2009 newsletter explained the preliminary draft alternatives. Later in April, the Interdisciplinary Planning Team met to identify a preferred alternative using a *Choosing by Advantages* process.

Summary of Public Comments Received on the Shoreline Management Plan Environmental Assessment

The *Shoreline Management Plan Environmental Assessment* was released for a 45-day public review period from September 28, 2009 through November 11, 2009. Approximately 345 EAs were printed (75) or published on CD (270) and distributed to the park's mailing list, including to individuals, agencies, non-profit organizations and government officials. The EA was also available in the following public libraries: Kettle Falls, Grand Coulee, and the City of Colville. Four public meetings were held during the public review period: in Colville (October 5, attended by five people), Coulee Dam (October 6, attended by ten people), Davenport (October 7, attended by thirty people) and Spokane (October 8, attended by twelve people). Approximately 123 verbal comments were recorded on flipcharts at these meetings. The press release announcing the public comment period was sent to the following newspapers on September 24, 2009: *The Star* (Grand Coulee), *Wilbur Register*, *Davenport Times*, *Statesman Examiner* (Colville), *Spokesman Review* (Spokane). Approximately 256 comments were identified from approximately 28 letters and emails from 25 individuals, two groups (National Parks Conservation Association, Moccasin Bay Association) and one county (Stevens County Commissioners) received during the formal public review period. These were sorted into approximately 24 concern categories.

The following categories of concerns within the scope of the project were raised:

- Adaptive management (site analysis report, greater public need, adaptive management data gathering)
- Length of boat launches
- Swim areas
- Proposed trails
- Proposed Moccasin Bay boat launch / parking area
- Proposed Rickey Point deepwater boat launch
- Proposed Community Access Point (cap) buoy fields
- Proposed camping permit system
- Number and location of floating toilets
- Proposed requirement for day use boaters to carry portable toilets
- Need to expand camping
- Noise
- Beach fires
- Crescent Bay development concept plan proposals

Comments approving, recommending, or disapproving of an alternative or element of an alternative included:

- *Alternative A is the best choice until Rickey Point is shown to be the only site on the northern part of the lake that can accommodate a boat launch.*
- *Alternative B is the most comprehensive alternative, maximizing recreation benefits, while minimizing environmental damage.*

- *The suggested improvements to the Spokane Arm area will improve visitor access and experience.*
- *The suggested improvements to the Crescent Bay area will improve visitor access and experience.*
- *Alternative B will best protect and enhance the natural and cultural resources of the recreation area.*
- *Alternative C is the best choice, because it includes most of the mgmt elements of Alt B, along with fewer development and expansion elements*
- *Alternative C is better because it costs less.*
- *Alternative D provides for more camping access, without the restrictions of a permit system.*

Comments Outside the Scope of the Shoreline Management Plan

The following concerns were raised but were eliminated from further consideration (and are not discussed or analyzed) in the EA either because they are outside the scope of the proposed project, propose options that are not reasonable and/or feasible, or were alternatives rejected during the planning process and/or do not meet the project purpose and need.

Public Comments: Miscellaneous: Other Natural Resources Issues

- *The Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) does not address the major problems of the lake, such as erosion, pine beetle impacts, and lack of care at NPS sites.*
- *Prevent beach erosion to preserve camping.*
- *The plan does not address stabilization of the steep shorelines and potential for landslides associated with the rapid raising and lowering of water in the lake.*
- *Are there current plans to manage fish in Crescent Lake?*

Public Comments: Miscellaneous: Project Funding

- *The study funds could be better used elsewhere on lake-wide shoreline problems.*
- *The SMP is a waste of time and energy, because the plan money could have been used to improve facilities that protect the environment, such as additional toilets.*

Public Comments: Miscellaneous: Lake Level Fluctuations

- *Avoid large fluctuations in the lake level; lower it during 4th of July weekend.*

Public Comments: Miscellaneous: Vacation Cabins

Inclusion of vacation cabin sites in Shoreline Management Plan

- *The vacation cabins at Rickey Point and Sherman Creek are and should remain a legal use allowed by the General Management Plan.*
- *The vacation cabin sites should not be included in the SMP, because they are being evaluated through a separate management plan.*

Existing Cabin Uses

- *Cabin owners have a longstanding commitment to Lake Roosevelt as well as a personal attachment, and financial investment in the recreation area.*
- *Vacation cabin owners maintain their area of the lake to a high standard.*
- *The potential uses of the vacation cabin sites do not offer the recreational diversity and revenue generation now provided by the cabins.*

Boat-in Campground at Sherman Creek

- *The Sherman Creek vacation cabin sites should not be made a boat-in campground because of the fluctuation in water level, the steep water access, and the presence of the existing, legal, vacation cabins.*
- *The Site Analysis shows “potential for new boat launch, day use and campground” at Rickey Point. This could be used to establish a greater public need for the areas.*

Public Comments: Miscellaneous: Law Enforcement Issues

- *There have been some bad encounters with ranger staff at Seven Bays.*
- *Address repeated problems of fires, trash and waste from beach campers that occur after park rangers leave the scene.*

Public Comments: Miscellaneous: Houseboats

- *Address houseboat docking problem near Inchelium. Logs have been placed to deter beaching.*
- *With the increase in gas prices, houseboats now set up camp on prime beaches.*

Public Comments: Miscellaneous: Castlegar Pulp Plant

- *Take action with regards to the Canadian hazardous waste facility on the Kettle River.*
- *Address concerns regarding the Castlegar Pulp Plant.*

Public Comments: Adaptive Management

Site Analysis Report

- *The vacation cabin areas should be removed from the Site Analysis.*

Greater Public Need

- *A greater public need has not been identified for the vacation cabin areas.*

Agency Consultation

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

The NPS will consult with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) prior to project implementation regarding wetland permitting for the Glacier Point Road Rehabilitation Project, under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899.

The NPS will submit necessary supporting documentation to the ACOE as necessary to obtain any necessary permits prior to any ground -breaking activities as required under the Clean Water Act.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

The NPS requested a project-area species list from the USFWS on September 24, 2008, who responded on October 29, 2008. This list was used as the basis for the special status species analysis in this Environmental Assessment. A complete copy of the Environmental Assessment was sent to the agency during the public review period. No additional consultation with the USFWS is necessary because the Selected Alternative will have *no effect* on any federally listed threatened or endangered species or critical habitat and will not result in harm to other sensitive species.

Washington State Historic Preservation Officer / Advisory Council for Historic Preservation 9-24-08

An initial consultation letter was sent to the Washington State SHPO on September 24, 2008. In accordance with the NPS Programmatic Agreement, professional staff from Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area identified and evaluated historic properties in the area of potential effect. The staff determined that implementation of the Selected Alternative will have “no adverse effect” on historic properties identified as eligible for listing on the NRHP (36 CFR 800). Individual concurrence on

proposed actions will be sought from SHPO. Among these actions include the proposed Moccasin Bay development, deepwater boat launch, and area trails, including the proposed trail along the historic irrigation ditch in the Kettle Falls area.

American Indian Consultation

National Park Service consultation with culturally associated American Indian groups occurred throughout the development of the Lake Roosevelt Shoreline Management Plan Environmental Assessment. Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area consulted with American Indian tribes having cultural association with the lake, including the Spokane Tribe of the Spokane Reservation and the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, whose representatives also served on the Interdisciplinary Planning Team. Information sharing and project planning will continue throughout the planning and implementation of the proposed project and, in fact, the Selected Alternative calls for additional coordination and collaboration with these tribes. Consultation with the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer is ongoing. Additional formal consultation will occur following the development of a specific proposal for Moccasin Bay.

Finding

On the basis of the information contained in the Environmental Assessment as summarized above, it is the determination of the National Park Service that the proposed project is not a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. Nor is it an action without precedent or similar to an action that normally requires an Environmental Impact Statement. The conclusions of non-significance are supported by the conservation planning and environmental impact analysis completed and the capability of listed mitigation measures to reduce or eliminate impacts. No adverse effects to cultural or historical resources will occur; there are no unacceptable impacts, nor will any impairment of cultural or natural resources or park values occur. This determination also included due consideration of the minor nature of public comments, agency, tribal and county recommendations. Therefore, in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, an Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared, and portions of the selected project may be implemented immediately, while others will be implemented as soon as practicable, pending other requirements, funding and staffing.

Recommended:

Debbie Bird

6/24/2010

Debbie Bird, Superintendent
Lake Roosevelt National Recreation Area

Date

Approved:

Geo J. Turnbull
George J. Turnbull, Acting Regional Director
Pacific West Region

6/25/10

Date