

USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region
Willamette National Forest
Detroit Ranger District

DECISION NOTICE / FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

for the

**Upper Arm Day-Use Development
and Site Enhancement**

Breitenbush Watershed, Township 9S., Range 5E., Section 36., WM

Marion County, Oregon

Decision

I have decided to implement ***Alternative 4 with the conceptual design changes identified in Alternative 5*** of the Upper Arm Day-Use Development and Site Enhancement Environmental Assessment (EA). Alternative 4 includes the same improvements as described in the Proposed Action (Alternative 2), except that boat-in mooring docks are eliminated. Also, boats will not be allowed to moor along the general shoreline at the Upper Arm Developed Day-Use site.

Alternative 5 included some conceptual design changes regarding toilets, parking, and fishing platforms that were widely accepted by the public. We will attempt to include all the design changes described in Alternative 5, but we may be limited by the topography or other landscape features, and by cost constraints. I want to emphasize that the final design for the campground may look very different from the conceptual drawings shown in the Upper Arm Environmental Assessment.

The mitigation described on page 22 of the Upper Arm EA is included as part of my decision. A special order in accordance with 36 CFR, Part 261 subpart B may be implemented to restrict boats from mooring along the general shoreline in the developed site area.

The final design for the Upper Arm Day-Use Development will be accomplished through a contract with a private architect. We will provide the architect the following design objectives from Alternative 5:

- **Toilets**
 - Locate a set of toilets so that they are visible from the entrance and parking area;
 - Place restrooms in a manner to facilitate the needs of the users and to protect resources;

- o Meet American with Disabilities Act requirements and possibly include unisex family-units that are large enough for adults to assist young children and provide room for changing clothing and swimwear.
- **Picnic Area and Parking**
 - o Segregate (compartmentalize) parking to keep parking and use areas separated;
 - o Provide parking for 35 – 45 vehicles, but minimize paving by compacting the area devoted to parking and roads;
 - o Minimize the expense associated with cut and fill, which may result in using the topographic features for locating parking and picnic areas;
 - o Retain vegetation and the scenic integrity of the site.
- **Fishing Platform**
 - o Create several small fishing platforms and rocked surface areas located where fishing is already occurring and to disperse anglers along the shoreline so that crowding is avoided.

My decision to implement ***Alternative 4 with the conceptual design changes identified in Alternative 5*** is based on several factors. Alternative 4 was developed to address the issue that providing boat docks would encourage more motorized boat use to Upper Arm, potentially conflicting with other activities such as swimming and fishing, creating safety hazards, and increase noise disturbance. Reducing conflicts among uses and safety hazards were important to the public who submitted comments for this project, as well as being important to the Forest Service. In Alternative 5, the public suggested all of the conceptual design changes. Attempting to adopt these ideas into the final design should make the area more attractive and desirable to the public as a recreational area.

Purpose and Need for Action

The purpose and need for action is discussed in the EA on pages 5-8. In summary, the underlying purpose for this project is to implement direction in the Forest Plan to meet day-use needs by developing a day-use facility on the north side of Detroit Lake near Highway 22 and the City of Detroit. Current management and facilities at the Upper Arm Recreation Site do not meet Forest Plan objectives for providing a quality recreation setting. Converting and Reconstructing Upper Arm to a formal day-use facility would fulfill this need.

In addition to meeting the recreation demands for day-use recreation facilities at Detroit Lake there is a need to:

- Improve sanitation conditions with permanent restroom facilities to provide a healthful and safe environment;
- Minimize social conflicts caused by visitor congestion and conflicting uses at the lake;
- Reduce road congestion and parking shortages at recreation sites around Detroit Lake;
- Provide safe road, trail and shoreline access within the Upper Arm Recreation Site, including safe access to the site from the Breitenbush Road;
- Provide an aesthetic lakeside recreation environment;

- Restore resource conditions from uncontrolled recreation use that resulted in continuing compaction and displacement of soil, shoreline erosion, and damage and loss of vegetation.

Other Alternatives Considered in Detail

Alternative 1: – No Action: Maintain Existing Informal Day-Use Area and Five Designated Campsites – The No Action alternative results in no change from the current condition and does not meet the Purpose and Need for Action. I did not select this alternative because all of the management problems that we now encounter would continue.

Alternative 2: The Proposed Action: Develop Day-Use Area and Eliminate Camping – I did not select this alternative because it included boat-in moorage docks. The findings of the analysis displayed in the Upper Arm EA is that boat docks are likely to result in conflicts between the boater use and the swimming and fishing use. The boat-in moorage docks may also cause a safety hazard for the swimmers.

Alternative 3: -- Develop Day-Use Area and Reconstruct Campground - Alternative 3 was developed to address the issue of allowing camping. Only a few people raised this issue during the public scoping process; however, I think others share the concern but did not submit comments. I did not select this alternative because the conflicts between day use and overnight use would continue, plus some of the late night law enforcement needs would continue. My decision to not select Alternative 3 may displace some campers; however, we are eliminating only five (5) campsites out of nearly 1,000 campsites around Detroit Lake, so there are other locations for the campers to move to. I believe, that overall, the area will better serve the public as a day-use site as opposed to trying to maintain a few campsites within a very small area.

Comment Period and Comments Received

The availability of the environmental assessment and proposed action for this project was first published in the Eugene Register-Guard and Statesman Journal on June 23, 2002. Copies of the EA were mailed to 45 parties who requested the document. Comments were accepted until July 23, 2002. A total of 5 letters were received resulting in 30 substantive comments. Substantive comments as defined by 36 CFR 215, and responses to those comments, are included in Appendix A of this document.

Consistency Findings Required by Other Laws & Regulations

I used the following Laws, Regulations and Policies as a basis for my decision:

1. My decision is consistent with the goals and objectives established in the Willamette National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan) as amended by the Record of Decision and Standards and Guidelines for Management of Habitat for Late Successional Species and Old Growth Dependent Species Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl (NWFP 1994).
2. My decision is consistent with the New Management Guidelines for Water Quality from the State of Oregon and the Clean Water Act. Design criteria that improve and protect riparian areas, will meet the Land and Resource Management Plan, as amended by the Northwest Forest Plan of 1994. Off-site erosion will remain at or below the limits set by the State of Oregon. All construction and restoration activities will be implemented in a manner to comply with current standards for soil, water, and riparian management. This would then constitute a no effect for soil and water related resources (EA, pages 31-33, 42-43). Mitigation measures for this project will meet the requirements outlined in *General Water Quality Best Management Practices (PNW Region Nov. 1988)*. (EA, Appendix B)
3. My decision is consistent with the National Historic Preservation Act (October 1966). A cultural resource inventory has been completed for the Upper Arm Day-Use Development and Site Enhancement project. All field surveys, certified by the District Archaeologist, were completed during the spring of 2002. No heritage sites have been discovered within the Upper Arm project area, and implementation of the selected action will have no effect on heritage resources. A heritage resource report has been completed and forwarded to the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) in accordance with 36 CFR 800.5 (B). The Forest Archaeologist has reviewed the finding of No Effect to heritage resources and has concurred with this finding.

Although no sites were discovered during the course of the surveys, there remains the possibility that buried prehistoric or historic cultural remains are present subsurface. Monitoring of the major excavation work during the construction will be conducted in order to extend protection to cultural resources which have not yet been discovered, but which may be uncovered during the course of project activities. Activities will be suspended until evaluations are made to insure the protection of any unknown heritage resources in the area. (EA, page 41)

4. My decision is consistent with the Endangered Species Act. A Biological Evaluation (BE) for the EA was completed (located in the Project Record, sections G and H) and addresses the effects on Threatened and Endangered wildlife and fish species. The findings were that the project would not have adverse affects on threatened, endangered, or sensitive species or their habitat. (EA, pages 38 & 40)
5. The Upper Arm Day-Use Development and Site Enhancement EA was completed in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The range of alternatives is adequate and sufficiently responds to the issues raised during public scoping. The

analysis was sufficient to provide the information to make an informed decision. Documentation of the analysis process is located in the Upper Arm Day-Use Development and Site Enhancement EA project record and available from the Detroit Ranger District office upon request.

Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)

I have reviewed the Upper Arm Day-Use Development and Site Enhancement environmental assessment. Based on the site specific analysis documented in the environmental assessment, I have determined that this is not a major federal action and it will have no significant effects on the quality of the human environment; therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared.

In making this determination, I have considered beneficial and adverse direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental impacts discussed in the Environmental Assessment, which has disclosed these effects within the appropriate context and intensity. This determination was made considering the following rationale:

Context

Detroit Lake serves as a major "backyard destination" for many visitors from the Willamette Valley/Portland Metropolitan area and Central Oregon communities, and is within a two-hour drive of nearly 3 million people. The proximity of the site to a majority of Oregon's population provides an opportunity for visitors to make a convenient day trip to the lake. Detroit Lake is the second heaviest used boating lake in Oregon. The community of Detroit (pop. 320) hosts up to 7000 visitors at a time, resulting in campgrounds, marinas and day-use areas being filled to capacity. The community of Detroit, Oregon is also located on Detroit Lake, and is economically dependent upon the water related recreation. Through local, county, state and federal support, Detroit Lake was incorporated into the Federal Recreation Lakes Demonstration Project and has both regional and potential national significance. In addition, the Upper Arm Recreation site is located along the West Cascades National Scenic Byway.

In 1992 a Detroit Lake Composite Area Management Guide was prepared, which provided a framework for orderly development of Forest Service lands and water resources within the composite area. The study evaluated existing recreation and resource conditions, analyzed the suitability of the land base for various developments and included an extensive market survey of visitors needs. This market study revealed the need for day-use recreation facilities on the north side of Detroit Lake. It also found that developed day-use facilities near Detroit and Highway 22 should cater to lake visitors and byway travelers. There is public interest to provide day-use facilities that attract short-term users, and encourages visitor spending in local communities on a year-round basis to support a tourism-based economy.

Intensity

1. Impacts may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant effect may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on a balance the effects will be beneficial.

The implementation of the selected action will have beneficial and adverse impacts to resources and individuals that use the Upper Arm Recreation Site, but individually or cumulatively they will not be significant. Overall, the project will improve the existing riparian resource conditions, health and safety of the recreation site and its aesthetic appearance, and help meet visitors demand for day-use recreation facilities and opportunities at Detroit Lake.

A small number of the boaters will be displaced to other dispersed areas that provide a similar setting to Upper Arm. Similarly, campers would be displaced to other nearby dispersed campsites or developed campgrounds especially between Memorial and Labor Day weekends. Use within Forest Service campgrounds around the lake and along the Breitenbush, including Upper Arm, drastically drops after the summer season, and are either closed or open with limited services. Year-round camping at Upper Arm would not be available; however, this would not displace many off-season campers and there are other non-fee sites available for those individuals who might be displaced. After hunting season, very few campers currently use campgrounds along the Breitenbush including Upper Arm. Four nearby campgrounds would continue to have campsites available to off-season recreationists, free-of-charge with no services. (EA, page 25-26)

Oregon State Parks operates Mongold State Park, a day-use area with a boat launch, and is proposing to expand their day-use recreation capacity to accommodate boat-in access, additional picnicking and swimming, and reduce the existing conflicts between boating and other waterfront recreational activities. The State's proposed Master Plan includes two public beaches with construction of one new swim area that would be designated a no-boat zone. The existing beach and swim area would be enhanced for use primarily by the boating public and help fulfill this demand. A significant amount of boating activity occurs at this part of the lake, and would provide adequate space and a more convenient location for enhanced boater day-use opportunities. This would serve a large number of boaters since this is the location where the majority of boat launching occurs, and within vicinity of most boaters activities at the lake. (EA, page 28)

2. The degree to which the proposed action affects public health or safety.

The Upper Arm Day-Use Development and Site Enhancement project will improve public health and safety, and reduce social conflicts and resource impacts by developing facilities necessary to ameliorate the current problems (EA, page 42).

Maintaining the site in its current condition, which is insufficient to accommodate current use levels, would continue to cause social conflicts, public health and safety

concerns, and resource impacts. The site lacks formal organization to regulate use effectively and would continue to cause the need for more attention by law enforcement. Limited parking controls create haphazard parking situations that would be difficult to manage, and hinder response by emergency vehicles. The undeveloped appearance of the area would continue to invite some illegal camping and campfires in the day-use area. Lack of adequate sanitation facilities would increase risk to health and water quality from improper disposal of human waste and littering. Vandalism, other deviant and inappropriate behaviors would likely continue at this site as it has in the past. Safety problems would continue to stem from congested and unorganized parking, limited site-distance at the entrance to the site, and numerous steep user-created trails that access the lake along eroding banks.

3. Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers or ecologically critical areas.

The Upper Arm Day-Use Development and Site Enhancement project improves an existing developed recreation site. The project will enhance day-use lakeside recreation opportunities at the lake while improving the condition of the environment and health and safety of the site.

No historic or cultural resources have been discovered within the Upper Arm Day-Use Development and Site Enhancement area; therefore, there will be no effect on these resources (EA page 41).

The Upper Arm Day-Use Development and Site Enhancement area has no farm land or range land and therefore will have no effect on these resources (EA, page 44).

There are no meadows, and the wetlands and floodplain associated with this site are influenced by reservoir drawdown dynamics. Reservoir levels are manipulated by the Army Corps of Engineers, and are based on a complex set of meteorological, social, political and ecological criteria. This projects effect on downstream flood plains or wetlands is negligible due to the greater influence of the reservoir on these systems (EA, page 42). The drawdown vegetation of the wetlands adjacent to the project area is dominated by reed canarygrass (*Phalaris arundinacea*), a noxious weed, which will be controlled and replaced with native vegetation to the extent practicable.

The project area is not located within a Wild and Scenic River corridor so there will be no effect to rivers listed on the National Wild and Scenic River System (EA, page 41).

No irreversible and/or irretrievable use of the soils or geologic resources is anticipated beyond that which has been previously identified in the Willamette National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, as amended by the Northwest Forest Plan of 1994. Irretrievable commitments of resources occur as a result of land management activities. Under multiple-use management some irretrievable

commitments of resources are unavoidable and acceptable at developed recreation sites (EA, pages 42-43).

The Upper Arm Day-Use Development and Site Enhancement project meets the Clean Water Act, and through design criteria that improve and protect riparian areas riparian areas, will meet the Land and Resource Management Plan, as amended by the Northwest Forest Plan of 1994 (EA's, pages 31-33, 42-43).

4. The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.

The effects of my decision are not likely to be highly controversial by the scientific community. Comments have been received from Oregon State Marine Board, and we have consulted with State Historic Preservation Office. All concur that the selected action will have no significant effects to the environment (located in Project Record).

5. The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment is highly uncertain or involves unknown risks.

There are no effects on the human environment that are highly uncertain or involve unknown risks. The information available in the EA is adequate to make an informed decision (EA, pages 25-44).

6. The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represent a decision of principle about a future consideration.

This decision does not set precedent for future actions that may have a significant effect.

7. Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.

The selected actions are not expected to create significantly cumulative effects.

8. The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, travelways, structures or objects listed in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant cultural or historical resources.

There are no structures or objects listed in the National Register of Historic Places within or near the project area. No cultural or historical resources have been discovered within the Upper Arm Day-Use Development and Site Enhancement area, and the implementation of the selected action will have no effect on heritage resources (EA page 41). Although no sites were discovered during the course of the surveys, there remains the possibility that buried prehistoric or historic cultural remains are present subsurface. Monitoring of the major excavation work during

the construction will be conducted in order to extend protection to cultural resources which have not yet been discovered, but which may be uncovered during the course of project activities. Activities will be suspended until evaluations are made to insure the protection of any unknown heritage resources in the area.

9. The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act.

A Biological Evaluation (BE) for the project was completed (located in the Project Record, sections G and H) and addresses the effects on Threatened and Endangered wildlife, and fish species. The project area does not contain nesting or roosting habitat for bald eagles and Northern spotted owls that are listed under the Endangered Species Act, so the selected action will not adversely affect these species, or their habitat. The selected action has no effect on winter steelhead, spring Chinook salmon, bull trout, or Oregon Chub that are listed under the Endangered Species Act. This action also will not affect critical habitat under the Endangered Species Act or essential fish habitat under the Magnuson-Stevens Act.

10. Whether or not the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law protection of the environment.

This action complies with relevant federal, state and local laws, regulations and requirements designed for the protection of the environment. The selected alternative will meet or exceed requirements for State water and air quality.

Implementation Date

If no appeal is filed, the USDA Forest Service will implement the Upper Arm Day-Use Development and Site Enhancement five days after the close of the forty-five day appeal period, which starts on the date the legal notice announcing the decision appears in the Eugene Register-Guard. If an appeal is filed, implementation of this decision will occur 15 days following the date of the appeal disposition.

Appeal Rights

This decision is subject to appeal by people or organizations who have provided comments or otherwise expressed interest in this proposed action pursuant to 36 CFR 215. Any written appeal of this decision must be fully consistent with 36 CFR 215.9 and must include the reason for an appeal pursuant to 36 CFR 215.14. A written appeal, in duplicate, must be postmarked and submitted to the following address within 45 days of the date that the legal public notice of this decision appears in the Eugene Register-Guard newspaper.

Appeal Deciding Officer
Regional Forester
Attn: 1570 Appeals
P.O. Box 3623
Portland, OR 97208-3623

For further information about this project, contact:

Dani Pavoni, Recreation Planner
HC 73 Box 320
Mill City, OR 97360
Phone: (503) 854-4208

Responsible Official: /s/  Date: October 29, 2002

STEPHANIE A. PHILLIPS
District Ranger
Detroit Ranger District
HC 73 Box 320
Mill City, OR 97360

Appendix A: Public Involvement / Response to Comments From the Environmental Analysis

Public Involvement Process

The Detroit Ranger District Interdisciplinary Planning Team (ID Team) first initiated the Upper Arm Day Use Development and Site Enhancement in May 2001. Public involvement in the planning process for the Upper Arm Day Use Development and Site Enhancement was initiated through mailings. The project first appeared in the July 2001 edition of the Willamette National Forest planning newsletter, *FOREST FOCUS* followed by project updates in the October 2001, and January, April and July 2002 editions of the newsletter. This newsletter is sent quarterly to about 250 addressees. In addition, a copy of the Scoping Notice was sent on November 15, 2001 to a mailing list of over 137 individuals, organizations, and agencies, who had an interest in the Detroit Lake area.

The Upper Arm Day Use Development and Site Enhancement Scoping Notice was available for review on the Willamette National Forest web page at www.fs.fed.us/r6/willamette/mgmt/nepa/de.htm.

Comment Analysis Process

The Environmental Analysis (EA) was made available on June 23, 2002. Copies of the EA were mailed to 45 parties who requested the document, or were made available for review on the Willamette National Forest web site. A copy of the Public Comment Period letter informing visitors of the EA was posted at the Upper Arm Recreation Site. The 30-day public comment period ended on July 23, 2002. Five individuals submitted comments. Copies of the comment letters are available in the project record located at the Detroit Ranger District office.

Comments from each letter are listed in the table below in alphabetical order by resource concern. References are made to the Upper Arm Day-Use Site Development and Enhancement EA where appropriate.

Boat Docks and Conflicts		
Name of Commenter	Public Comment	Forest Service Response
Karen Sjogren	Purpose and Need: You will not reduce conflicts and safety concerns resulting from crowding boaters, swimmers and other shoreline users into the same area if you allow boaters in the Upper Arm area. You will have simply moved the problem to a different location. (p. 6).	<p>The effects analysis of Alternative 2 on Page 27 disclosed that maximizing the range of day-use recreation activities would crowd a number of conflicting types of recreational activities – swimming, boating and fishing – in a relatively small area, which could affect users experience and enjoyment of the area for a quiet and relaxed setting.</p> <p>The Oregon State Marine Board (OSMB) is the responsible agency for regulating recreational boating on Detroit Lake. The Marine Board does not plan to designate a no motorboat zone within the Breitenbush arm.</p>
Karen Sjogren	Boat-in watercraft use is contrary to the other desired conditions of a safe, healthful and aesthetic environment, improvements consistent with resource protection needs, and facilities subordinate to the focal attraction, as unobtrusive as possible to harmonize with the natural environment. Boat-in use will also not minimize social conflicts caused by conflicting uses. (pp. 7-8).	The effects analysis of Alternative 3 on page 30 disclosed that facilities would be a dominant feature on the shoreline and would not be subordinate to this focal attraction, which may diminish the visual quality of a natural recreation setting and affect visitor experiences. All action alternatives meet Federal General Water Quality Best Management Practices and are outlined in Appendix B.

Boat Docks and Conflicts - Continued		
Name of Commenter	Public Comment	Forest Service Response
Karen Sjogren	<u>Tables.</u> The mitigation measures are good (Table 2-1). With respect to Table 2-2, there is still a safety hazard to swimmers in the swim area from boats and a health hazard from diesel fumes in the water.	The effects of having boats in close proximity to swimmers are discussed in Chapter 3 of the EA, pages 26 - 29. The swimming area would be delineated by an enclosure, required by the Oregon State Marine Board, to keep boats out of the swimming area and provide safety to the swimmers. The docks would be an attractive platform for people to fish, dive and swim, and sunbathe on, so some safety concerns would likely result around the docks regardless of posting regulations prohibiting these activities.
Karen Sjogren	<u>Alternative 2.</u> I do not think there should be any boat dock, but if there is it should certainly not be next to the swimming area and fishing platform!	The decision is to implement Alternative 4, which does not provide for boat moorage facilities; thereby, reducing many of the safety hazards to swimmers.

Camping		
Name of Commenter	Public Comment	Forest Service Response
Karen Sjogren	Alternative 3. While camping cannot be blamed for all of the vandalism and illegal firearm use at Detroit Lake, it does increase it and for this reason should not be allowed at this location, especially since only five campsites are there anyway.	The effects analysis of Alternative 3 on page 35 disclosed an increased need for law enforcement patrols if both day and overnight facilities were provided at the site and vandalism would likely continue. The Forest Service has documented cases where vandalism has occurred by the campers themselves or in the presence of other campers (see effects of Alternative 1 on page 34).

Day Use		
Name of Commenter	Public Comment	Forest Service Response
Karen Sjogren	<u>Issue Statement 1.</u> You wrongly assume that day use is entirely tied to lake levels. I actually use the area for hiking, and then only after Labor Day.	This issue statement was a summary of the comments made by the public. Upper Arm does receive use during the off-season, however, the majority of use does occur during the summer months when the lake is at full pool.
Karen Sjogren	<u>Issue Statement 3.</u> I very much like the four improvements noted on page 29. You may want to look at the Silver Falls day-use area as an example of how picnic areas can be separated from parking (in the swimming area) and restrooms placed adjacent to parking. I like the idea of multiple smaller fishing platforms as opposed to one large pier.	Thank you for your comment.

Fish		
Name of Commenter	Public Comment	Forest Service Response
Karen Sjogren	If this area becomes a migratory passage area for fish runs, it will become increasingly important to protect fish habitat and water quality, and another reason to preclude use by boats.	There is little expectation that boat use in this area, where 5 mph is the speed limit, would have any negative impacts on existing or future fish migration. Future adult salmon migration would generally take place when the reservoir is full (summer) and the depth of water at that time in the upper arm area would minimize any potential contact with boats and therefore any impacts. Impacts to the migration of existing salmon smolts (from hatchery fish spawning) and any future migration of steelhead adults and smolts would be minimized due to the reservoir being low and therefore public use being low at the time of migration (winter/spring).

Law Enforcement		
Name of Commenter	Public Comment	Forest Service Response
Karen Sjogren	<u>Issue Statement 5.</u> I support any improvements, which will reduce vandalism. A gate will not prevent boaters from using the dock and the site at night. If overnight parking is allowed, vandalism and law enforcement problems will increase; these problems will decrease if the site is closed at dusk. Campground facilities will increase vandalism and law enforcement needs, which are already not met, and therefore should not be built and camping disallowed.	<p>The effects analysis of Alternative 2 on page 34 disclosed that overnight vehicle parking and use of the site might occur if boat docks are provided. The effects analysis of Alternative 3 on page 35 disclosed that the area could not be closed when the campground is open, and may be subject to a higher risk of vandalism especially at night. Vehicle traffic would be expected in the evening. Some illegal overnight camping or evening use would likely occur in the day-use area.</p> <p>The selected alternative does not include constructing a campground.</p>

Noise from Boats		
Name of Commenter	Public Comment	Forest Service Response
Karen Sjogren	<u>Table 2-2.</u> Obviously if the frequency of boats at the site increases, so will the level of noise, so "low" is wrong for the proposed action, as well as Alternative 5. I also do not think the administration and law enforcement cost will be low for the Proposed Action if you allow boats to dock here.	It is assumed that there would be a fairly constant flow of traffic, hence higher frequency of noise that may not provide a quiet setting many people desire (see effects of Alternative 2 on page 28). The narrow channel of Breitenbush Arm is a 5 mph no-wake zone so the noise level from motors is expected to stay relatively low as compared to the main body at Detroit Lake where boating speeds and boater congestion is higher.
Karen Sjogren	<u>Issue Statement 2.</u> Since the Arm "provides a relatively quiet setting compared to other parts of the lake", why spoil this by putting in a boat dock and moorage facilities? Why must you "maximize the range of day-use recreational opportunities" at this site when boating is the predominant recreational use of Detroit Lake as a whole? Your discussion of Alternative 2 is adequate, except the 5-mph no-wake zone will not keep noise to a low level. Jet ski boats are noisy, period, as are many motorboats. Your discussion of Alternative 4 and 5 is good and an accurate description of environmental impact.	

Operation and Maintenance Costs		
Name of Commenter	Public Comment	Forest Service Response
Karen Sjogren	<u>Issue Statement 1.</u> Any additional off-season use due to campground facilities would be offset by the added law enforcement cost, so is not justified as a construction and maintenance expense.	The effects analysis of Alternative 3 on page 37 disclosed that in general the few number of campsites provided would not generate enough revenue for the operation and maintenance of the campground including law enforcement.
Karen Sjogren	<u>Issue Statement 6.</u> The boat docks would not be cost effective, this being another reason not to build them. If you allow boats any sort of tie-up in this area, it would be unfair to charge a user fee to those entering by the roadway since boat users would not have to pay it. Otherwise, a reasonable user fee would probably decrease the incidence of vandalism and reduce the need for law enforcement, if the area is patrolled at regular intervals (at least twice daily during the summer).	<p>The effects analysis of Alternative 2 on page 36 disclosed that boat docks might not be cost-effective to construct, operate and maintain due to the limited use season and for the few numbers of boats it would accommodate. It would be more difficult to administer a user-fee to boat users. However, the selected alternative does not construct a boat dock.</p> <p>The option to charge a user-fee under all action alternatives would be available and could help off-set the cost of operation and maintenance.</p>

Purpose and Need		
Name of Commenter	Public Comment	Forest Service Response
Karen Sjogren	Purpose and Need: I agree that there is a need for restoring resource conditions, developing day-use facilities that provide a quality recreation setting, and providing barrier-free access to persons with disabilities in the Upper Arm area of Detroit Lake (p. 5).	Thank you for your comment.

Range of Alternatives		
Name of Commenter	Public Comment	Forest Service Response
Karen Sjogren	Issue Statements: I simply agree with other public comments sharing my concerns about boating in this area. I like the design alternatives and do not believe they should be presented as a separate alternative, but rather as modifications of the other alternatives, to the degree possible. Allowing camping would increase, rather than decrease, the incidence of vandalism.	Some people would like to see boat docks at Upper Arm while others do not. A separate alternative was developed to not include docks. It gives the decision-maker a range of alternatives from which to select, including parts of one or more alternatives. The design changes that were recommended by the public were to modify the proposed action. Some of the design changes could not be implemented if the site were developed as a campground due to the size and configuration of the site. The decision maker has the flexibility to select those parts of the design change alternative that would be feasible to implement with any of the alternatives.
Karen Sjogren	Alternative 5 is not really an alternative but rather design changes recommended by the public, which you have tacked on to the proposed action. By presenting this as an alternative, you give the public no choice but to recommend the Proposed Action in order to get the Design Changes. Instead, the Environmental Assessment should contain additional alternatives, which incorporate the design changes. I don't think the Design Changes could be instigated if camping were allowed, but if they can be there should be an additional alternative.	

Riparian Vegetation		
Name of Commenter	Public Comment	Forest Service Response
Karen Sjogren	<u>Issue Statement 4.</u> Any encouragement of boater use will be detrimental to the riparian habitat. Boats should not be allowed to tie up along the shore and signs should be posted prohibiting them from doing so.	As described in the effects analysis in Alternative 2 on page 33, waves created by boat wakes would cause bank erosion. Boat docks may increase boating activity within the Arm, and could cause increased bank erosion along the shorelines adjacent to the site. Under this alternative boats would not be allowed to moor along the general shoreline at the site and the shoreline would need to be signed accordingly.
Karen Sjogren	<u>Issue Statement 4.</u> Signs should also be posted prohibiting the cutting down of trees or vegetation for firewood. The gathering of down wood or cutting of trees for campfires could be discouraged by disallowing campfires entirely (if it becomes a day use only area or selling firewood). I think there is a significant difference between Alternatives 2 and 3 in terms of effects on the riparian area, although it would be detrimentally impacted under either alternative. A combination of Alternative 4 and 5 would have the least damaging impact on the riparian environment, and therefore is preferable to me.	As described in the effects analysis of Alternative 3 on page 33, when compared to Alternative 2, Alternative 3 poses a higher risk of possible damage to riparian resources due to activities typically associated with camping, such as gathering of down wood for campfires and cutting of vegetation. With the combination of the preferred Alternatives 4 and 5, damaging and cutting down vegetation should be reduced. Recreation site rules and regulations would be posted at the information board.
Karen Sjogren	Proposed Action: Clearing of trees, roads and parking lot location and construction should be compatible with resource condition restoration. It may be inadequate to plant vegetation to discourage indiscriminate foot travel - - I would suggest large boulders to keep vehicles out of natural areas.	Travel routes will be established and use areas would be hardened to manage use patterns on the site. Designed roads and parking areas will be developed to delineate where vehicles park. Curbing and other traffic controls and barriers will help keep vehicles out of natural areas. Large boulders may be used as needed.

Size and Capacity of Site in Alternative 2

Name of Commenter	Public Comment	Forest Service Response
Karen Sjogren	<p><u>Alternative 2.</u> This area is simply not large enough to accommodate 30 picnic tables, 45 parking places, and a boat-in moorage dock. (By the way, your introduction should contain the acreage of this site as well as its dimensions). The size of these facilities alone precludes a quality recreational experience, as well as true restoration of resource values. I much prefer the design modifications (Alternative 5), which call for a smaller parking facility. I do like the Actions to Protect and Enhance Resources (p. 17).</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The site description and acreage size is discussed in the introduction on page 4. The site is 5 acres and approximately 900 feet long by 200-450 feet wide. An engineering feasibility review determined there is adequate space for up to 45 parking spaces and would need to encumber portions of the upper and mid terrace of the site for parking development and adequate vehicle turn-around area. The current parking area has accommodated well over 50 vehicles. The decision calls for a range of 35 to 45 parking spaces. All action alternatives meet Federal General Water Quality Best Management Practices and are outlined in Appendix B.</p>

Support of the Forest Service's Potentially Preferred Alternative		
Name of Commenter	Public Comment	Forest Service Response
Ann Cavanagh	I heartily endorse your proposal to combine Alternative 4 and 5, as set forth in the third paragraph of your cover letter. Your proposal favors peaceful recreation, swimming, picnicking and dock fishing. I'm especially pleased with the reconfiguration of the parking lot in Alternative 5.	Thank you for your comments. The conceptual designs for each alternative display approximate location of facilities. A final design will be prepared that shows specific project details including location of facilities and construction details. Although location of facilities may vary slightly from the conceptual design, the types of facilities would not change.
Tom Vuyovich	Received your package on the upper arm. As the closest year-round human resident to the site, I really appreciate the plan to improve the location. Your proposed no boat Alternative with Alternative 5 enhancements is just great.	
Jeremy Hall	I hear that you're considering modification to the upper arm project plans per my comments and the comments of others. I'm glad to hear that. With the use that that area gets, it is clear that something needs to be done to control and focus the use in appropriate places. Thanks for all your work on this.	Certain aspects of design may change due to topography constraints, however the design objectives of Alternative 5 will remain the same in concept.
Karen Sjogren	Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Environmental Assessment. Alternative 4, combined with the improvements suggested by the public in Alternative 5, is the best alternative in terms of meeting the "desired conditions", and the alternative I prefer.	
Karen Sjogren	<u>Alternative 4.</u> This is the alternative I prefer, and the alternative, which best meets you desired conditions. I agree that boat docks would encourage more motorized boat use to Upper Arm, creating safety hazards, increasing noise disturbance, and conflicting with other recreational activities	
Karen Sjogren	<u>Alternative 5.</u> I like all of these modifications, and would "choose" this alternative if the Boat-in Dock were not part of the plan at all, and it most certainly should not be next to the swimming area. Since it cannot feasibly be relocated, it should be eliminated as part of the design.	

Survey and Manage Species		
Name of Commenter	Public Comment	Forest Service Response
Karen Sjogren	On page 38, it is unclear whether you are talking about red tree voles' nests or those of the bird species, which prey on them.	The survey was conducted to determine whether red tree voles are present. No red tree vole nests were located, which indicates red tree voles are not present.

Urban Quality		
Name of Commenter	Public Comment	Forest Service Response
Karen Sjogren	The "Urban Quality" sentence makes no sense. This section is generally conclusory in content and could be improved.	The section on Urban Quality (EA, page 43) is a summary of the analysis for the effects to the rural communities in the area. Because the project is located in a forest setting, there are no expected effects to the urban quality for the Cities of Detroit and Idanha.

Water Quality		
Name of Commenter	Public Comment	Forest Service Response
Sophia Hobet	<p>The North Santiam River is the primary drinking water source for 170,000 residents of Salem, Oregon. Maintaining and enhancing the quality of the North Santiam River is a high priority for the City [of Salem].</p> <p>The City is encouraged that the Upper Arm Day Use Development and Site Enhancement strives to provide a safe, healthful, and aesthetic atmosphere for the public. Improved parking areas and trails systems would help accommodate ever growing public use and constructing new restrooms will help alleviate the issue with sanitation. Upon review of the Environmental Assessment, the City is concerned that the possible negative affects on water quality are not being examined thoroughly.</p> <p>The City would like to see water quality addressed as an important aspect of the Environmental Assessment. The City hopes that any management decisions initiated at Detroit Lake will take into consideration the City's concerns. The City is confident that this issue will be properly covered and is eager to help in any way possible to make these improvements a reality. This could include a joint monitoring effort and/or an educational component.</p>	<p>Water quality is also a high priority for the Forest Service; hence, one of the reasons we believe that the proposal to improve the area is important. As described throughout the effects analysis on pages 31-33 and 43, we state that we can construct and maintain the new facilities with no detrimental effect to water quality and meet Best Management Practices (Appendix B, pg. 53), and help achieve the Aquatic Conservation Strategy Objectives (Appendix C, pg. 55).</p>