

Bend-Fort Rock Ranger District
Deschutes National Forest

HOSMER LAKE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVISION TO THE CASCADE LAKES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

USDA Forest Service
Deschutes County
Bend-Fort Rock Ranger District
Deschutes National Forest
1230 NE 3rd St., Suite A-262
Bend, OR 97701

DECISION NOTICE AND FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER II. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION

CHAPTER III. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

CHAPTER IV. COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES

CHAPTER V. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED

CHAPTER VI. EFFECTS

CHAPTER VII. DISCUSSION OF REASONABLE FORESEEABLE FUTURE ACTIONS WITHIN AND ADJACENT TO THE PROJECT AREA

CHAPTER VIII. LIST OF PREPARERS AND CONSULTATION WITH OTHERS

APPENDIX A. APPLICABLE STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF THE HOSMER LAKE AREA

APPENDIX B. HOSMER LAKE CAMPGROUNDS HAZARD TREE TREATMENT AND PUBLIC REVIEW PROCESS

APPENDIX C. PUBLIC COMMENTS COLLECTED AND HOW ADDRESSED

APPENDIX D. FOREST SERVICE RESPONSE TO PROVINCIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

APPENDIX E. SUMMARY OF PUBLIC NOTICES

APPENDIX F. MONITORING

APPENDIX G. BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

APPENDIX H. HOSMER FACILITY DEVELOPMENT LEVEL

APPENDIX I. RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

[Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests Website](http://www.fs.fed.us/centraloregon/manageinfo/nepa/documents/bendfort/hosmer/coverindex.html)

<http://www.fs.fed.us/centraloregon/manageinfo/nepa/documents/bendfort/hosmer/coverindex.html>

Last Update: 6/8/01

R.A. Jensen

**Decision Notice
And
Finding of No Significant Impact
For
Hosmer Revision Project Environmental Assessment
Deschutes National Forest
Bend-Fort Rock Ranger District
Deschutes County, Oregon**

Location

The Hosmer Lake project area lies along the eastern slopes of the Cascade Range, about a mile east and south of Elk Lake and about 35 miles southwest of Bend, Oregon, a city with a population of approximately 50,000. It consists of the two campgrounds, South and Mallard Marsh, the boat ramp, and the islands and shoreline of Hosmer Lake. The area lies entirely on National Forest lands within Deschutes County.

Decision

I have decided to authorize implementation of **Alternative 4** for the Hosmer Revision Project Environmental Assessment (EA). Alternative 4 is the preferred alternative identified in the 30-day public review and comment period notice, published February 6, 2001 in The Bulletin. I have decided that Alternative 4 best meets the purpose and need for action and responds to the issues identified during the scoping process.

Alternative 4 will implement the following: construction of a new 11 vehicle parking area near the boat ramp access road; replace the boat ramp toilet with a facility that would meet the Americans With Disabilities Act standards; close the northernmost island to human use for at least 5 years to determine effectiveness for nesting waterfowl, shore birds, and neotropical migrant birds; there would be a seasonal closure (1/1 through 8/31) on the remaining two islands to mitigate any adverse effects from humans on nesting eagles; implement 3 dispersed camping zones on the lake and reduce the amount of camps from 13 to 8; it would continue with the current prohibition on campfires in the dispersed campsites until the amount of standing and dead lodgepole pine is no longer considered a high risk danger; and, it would provide informational and interpretive signing at the parking areas.

Along with Alternative 4, the following alternatives were also considered.

Alternative 1 is the No Action Alternative. Under the no action alternative no change to facilities would

be implemented and no changes in current management practices would take place. No improvements, except those required to protect public health and safety and provide immediate emergency resource protection, would occur.

This alternative would not meet the purpose and need of the proposed action. Under this alternative soils and vegetation would continue to be compacted and trampled as a result of unrestricted vehicle traffic and the lack of designated sites. Currently, over 25 vehicles per weekend day can be found within the boat ramp parking area during the peak season, with more vehicles parked along side the access road. Similarly, use at the dispersed campsites and islands would continue as is, impacting vegetation and wildlife habitat, as sites expand, and new sites develop, to meet group size and demand. Use would continue to increase concurrent with the population growth of Bend and central Oregon as a whole. Impacted areas at the boat ramp parking area, islands, and dispersed campsites could expand with an increase in use and lack of management controls.

Alternative 2 was the same actions proposed in the Cascade Lakes Environmental Restoration Project Environmental Assessment, with the exclusion of active vegetation management within the campground areas and a change from a system of proposed designated dispersed sites to a proposal for identifying specific areas, or zones, where dispersed camping would be allowed. As some of these actions were the point of appeal to the Cascade Lakes project, this alternative was considered a starting point from which to garner public comment so as to develop new alternatives. Where there are certain aspects of the alternative that meet the intent of the purpose and need, public comment identified a concern at the lack of public participation to develop other alternatives to better meet the project goals.

Alternative 3 was developed around input from a public working group. Through their suggestions, and subsequent Provincial Advisory Committee recommendations, this alternative was developed to address concerns brought up about the Proposed Action. Where many of the actions meet the purpose and need, it did not provide for informative and educational signing that can assist in protecting special areas around Hosmer Lake. The amount of available dispersed campsites was also reduced more than is needed at this time.

Public Participation

As this project initially began as part of the Cascade Lakes Environmental Restoration Project, scoping had previously been completed. Additionally, a summary of the proposed action was included in the spring 1998 through Winter 2000 Schedule of Projects (SOP), as well as public comments collected on site at various locations at Hosmer Lake by Field Rangers during the summers of 1999 and 2000.

As mentioned, a working group developed recommendations for the project and worked closely with several members of my staff for approximately two years.

A mailing of the Draft Alternatives was sent to the project mailing list on April 20, 2000. Several comments were received as to which alternative the sender favored. No substantive comments in regards to the content of the EA were received.

A notification of completion of the EA and a thirty-day comment period letter was mailed to the project mailing list (approximately 68 letters). The thirty-day notice and comment period for the Environmental Assessment and Preferred Alternative ended November 17, 2000. A request for public comment was published in The Bulletin on October 19, 2000. No comments were received.

After several interested parties informed me that they never received this initial notice, I withdrew the Decision and re-opened the comment period up for a second 30 days. The comment period for this second 30 days closed on March 9, 2001.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based on the site-specific analysis documented in the EA, I have determined that this decision does not constitute a major Federal action, individually or cumulatively, that will significantly affect the quality of the human environment; therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement will not be necessary.

Beneficial and adverse direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental impacts discussed in the Environmental Assessment have been disclosed within the appropriate context. No significant effects to the human environment have been identified. This determination is based on the mitigation measures designed into the selected alternative and the following factors:

1. Based on the analysis, I expect only slightly adverse, short duration impacts from implementation of this alternative. These have been disclosed in the analysis. This and other impacts are limited in scope and intensity and can be considered negligible (EA pages 35-41).
2. No adverse effects to public health or safety have been identified. This finding is based on past similar projects and no effects to public health or safety have been identified (EA p. 41).
3. There will be no significant adverse impacts to unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farm lands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.
4. The effects of these actions are not likely to be highly controversial.
5. Based on previous similar actions in the area the probable effects of this decision on the human environment, as described in the Environmental Assessment, are well known and do not involve unique or unknown risks.
6. This action does not establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects, nor does it represent a decision in principle about a future consideration. Designation of dispersed camping zones does not establish a need for other actions.
7. This decision is made with consideration of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions on National Forest land and other ownerships within potentially affected areas that could have a cumulatively significant effect on the quality of the human environment. I find there to be no such cumulative significance.
8. The Forest Archeologist applied criteria of effect and adverse effect as found in 36 CFR 800.9, and determined that implementation of this decision will have no adverse effect to sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic

Places or cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historic resources (EA, page 42).

9. The Biological Evaluation for the area indicates that the proposed project will have no significant adverse impacts on any Proposed, Endangered, Sensitive or Threatened plant or animal species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (see Biological Evaluation and EA).
10. This decision is in compliance with relevant Federal, State, and local laws, regulations, and requirements designed for the protection of the environment. Effects from this action will meet or exceed state water quality standards.

Other Findings

This action is consistent with the goals, objectives, and direction contained in the Record of Decision (ROD) for the Deschutes LRMP and accompanying Final Environmental Impact Statement dated August 27, 1990 as amended by the Northwest Forest Plan. It also is consistent with the preferred alternative of the Final Environmental Impact Statement for Forest Service Roadless Area Conservation, published November 2000, as well as the Decision Notice to change the implementation schedule for survey and manage and Protection Buffer Species, March 1999.

This decision is subject to appeal pursuant to 36 CFR 215.7. Any written appeal must be fully consistent with 36 CFR 215.4 (Content of an Appeal). Two copies of a written notice of appeal must postmarked and submitted to the Regional Forester, Pacific Northwest Region, P.O. Box 3623, Portland, Oregon, 97208-3623 within 45 days of the date the legal notice of this decision appears in The Bulletin. For additional information, contact Leslie Moscoso, Bend-Fort Rock Ranger District, 1230 NE Third, Ste. A-262, Bend Oregon, 97701, (phone 541-383-4712, email lmoscoso@fs.fed.us, or fax 541-383-4700).

WALTER C. SCHLOER, JR
District Ranger

Date

[Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests Website](http://www.fs.fed.us/centraloregon/manageinfo/nepa/documents/bendfort/hosmer/decisionnotice.html)

<http://www.fs.fed.us/centraloregon/manageinfo/nepa/documents/bendfort/hosmer/decisionnotice.html>

Last Update: 6/8/01

R.A. Jensen

HOSMER LAKE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVISION TO THE CASCADE LAKES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Location

The Hosmer Lake project area lies along the eastern slopes of the Cascade Range, about a mile east and south of Elk Lake. The project area is about 35 miles southwest of Bend, Oregon, a city with a population of approximately 50,000. The project area consists of the two campgrounds, South and Mallard Marsh, the boat ramp, and the islands and shoreline of Hosmer Lake. The project area lies entirely on National Forest lands within Deschutes County.

B. Project Area Background

Hosmer Lake is a 198-acre lake at 4,966 feet elevation within the 20,937 acre 5th field Elk sub-watershed. The blocking of spring-fed Quinn Creek from Mt. Bachelor lava flows formed the lake. Known originally as Mud Lake, the name was changed in 1962 in honor of Paul Hosmer, a well-known Bend naturalist. The mean depth and maximum depth are only 3.2 and 12 feet respectively, factors that lead to increased biological productivity. The trophic status is considered to be mesotrophic, or moderately biologically productive (Johnson, et al 1985).

The depth of the lake was increased 1-2 feet and the surface area increased in 1958 with the installation of a 4-foot high rock and masonry dam on the outlet along the southeastern shoreline. The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, under permit from the Forest Service, performed the construction. The dam is fitted with an Armco gate and 24-inch diameter, 12' long pipe to control lake levels (Fies, et al 1996). There is substantial leakage through the dam. There is no known active management of the lake levels via adjustment of the gate. Lake level fluctuations are dependent largely on precipitation levels and snow pack. Outflow from the lake quickly seeps into the lava landscape.

The lake is undergoing natural succession in transforming from a lake to a marsh with the deposition of sediments and the encroachment of vegetation. Construction of the dam has prolonged the transformation. Removal of the dam to restore the lake to a natural condition would lower the water level and transform much of the existing lake to mud flats, which would eventually revegetate.

In 1994 the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture jointly signed into law the record of decision for the Northwest Forest Plan, which amended the Land and Resource Management Plan for

the Deschutes National Forest. New standards and guidelines pertaining to wetland habitats, called "Riparian Reserves", were adopted to amend pre-existing management areas in the western portion of the Forest, which includes the Hosmer Lake area. The Northwest Forest Plan establishes an analysis process that evaluates watershed restoration needs through an ecosystem management approach implemented during watershed analyses. Watershed analyses are intended to guide future management actions that will meet the intent of the Northwest Forest Plan.

In 1995, the Hosmer Lake area was identified as "at risk" in the Cascade Lakes Watershed Analysis. It was at risk for ecosystem degradation as a result of a continuing trend in "increased recreation demand in developed and dispersed settings." This increase in recreational use creates conflicts between how people use the Hosmer Lake area and the condition of wetland and wildlife habitats. Also identified in the analysis was the trend of deteriorating recreation facilities and surrounding settings in dispersed and developed areas. The loss of biological, physical and social elements in the Hosmer Lake area has a higher likelihood of occurring than in other places (Cascade Lakes Watershed Analysis, Chapter III-4).

The Cascade Lakes Restoration Environmental Assessment (EA) was prepared in response to recommendations natural resource problems and restoration opportunities, protection, and enhancement identified in the Cascade Watershed Analysis and the Sheridan Mountain Late-Successional Reserve Assessment. In the area between Elk Lake and Crane Prairie Reservoir, past management and use patterns were recognized as having an effect on recreation experience, riparian habitat, forest health, late seral species habitat, natural succession and the risk of catastrophic wildfire.

Actions approved under the 1997 Decision Notice for the Cascade Lakes Restoration EA included improving forest health, reducing fuel hazards, and making changes within recreation sites to meet the new standards and guidelines for Riparian Reserves as designated in the Northwest Forest Plan. The "Friends of Hosmer" filed an appeal to the Decision Notice, specifically for the Hosmer Lake area. The Forest Service subsequently withdrew that portion of the decision affecting Hosmer Lake and its environs. The appeal was dismissed by the Regional Forester upon withdrawal of the relevant portions of the decision to the issues raised in the appeal. In response to the appeal, the District Ranger intensified efforts to work closely with this group, through the Deschutes Provincial Advisory Committee, in order to reach consensus on several issues and concerns. Some of the advice and recommendations of the Deschutes Provincial Advisory Committee form the basis of one of the alternatives analyzed in this EA. It is important to note that not all of the recommendations identified by the PAC are included within the scope of this EA. A discussion of the recommendations made by the PAC is found in [Appendix D](#).

GOTO

- Chapter I
- [Chapter II](#)

- [Chapter III](#)
- [Chapter IV](#)
- [Chapter V](#)
- [Chapter VI](#)
- [Chapter VII](#)
- [Chapter VIII](#)
- [Appendix A](#)
- [Appendix B](#)
- [Appendix C](#)
- [Appendix D](#)
- [Appendix E](#)
- [Appendix F](#)
- [Appendix G](#)
- [Appendix H](#)
- [Appendix I](#)

[Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests Website](#)

<http://www.fs.fed.us/centraloregon/manageinfo/nepa/documents/bendfort/hosmer/chapter1.html>

Last Update: 6/8/01

R.A. Jensen

HOSMER LAKE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVISION TO THE CASCADE LAKES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

II. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION

A. Need for Action

As recreational use expands at Hosmer Lake, there is a need to consider specific actions to help achieve some of the long-term management goals for the area. Long-term management goals for the Hosmer Lake area are to:

- Maintain and/or improve the recreation experience that our visitors have come to know and enjoy.
- Prevent damage to wetland and wildlife habitats.
- Restore wetland and wildlife habitats that have been damaged.

During the peak recreational season, human use is changing the characteristics of the area in terms of:

- Recreation facility function - the ability of recreation and transportation facilities to provide access to people with a wide range of capabilities and not harm the environmental setting.
- Recreation experience - the ability of the area to provide the sense of "naturalness", solitude and discovery visitors have come to know and enjoy.
- Wetland recovery - the ability of wetland vegetation to recover naturally from trampling or other disturbance.
- Wildlife habitat effectiveness - the ability of these habitats to serve as nesting, feeding, resting areas for wildlife.

Facility Function, and Accessibility; Wetland Recovery: Parking, Toilet

There is an existing parking area at the Hosmer Lake boat ramp. Built by filling in a section of marshy wetland at the edge of the lake, a large portion of the parking area becomes inundated with water during wet years. Parking becomes difficult and restoration of riparian/wetland vegetation becomes less feasible due to highly compacted conditions and cinder surfacing causing runoff conditions during spring snowmelt and heavy rainfall. During wet years, some of the parking area is inundated by lake water, reducing the usefulness of the area.

Parking in riparian areas, on both sides of the access roads to the boat ramp, and in the campgrounds is

most likely to occur on popular holiday weekends. In addition to damage of vegetation and soil compaction, safety standards are compromised with the decreased widths of access roads due to the erratic parking. The existing toilet and pathway are not accessible to people who have a limited range of abilities.

The desired conditions are to locate and design parking areas that are suited to the site in terms of size and configuration, to provide protection for riparian areas from vehicular traffic, and to make facility improvements at developed sites to meet universal design standards for accessibility and to offer a recreation experience that is fully accessible.

Recreation Experience, Wetland Recovery & Wildlife Habitat: Dispersed Camping

Dispersed camping is a term used to define camping outside of a developed campground. At Hosmer Lake, dispersed camping occurs along the lakeshore or on the islands ([see Figure 1](#)). During peak weekends some dispersed campsites around the Lake are crowded with five or six parties, using most or the entire limited wetland habitat available along selected shorelines or coves. Such crowding also diminishes the experience of solitude, quiet, or scenic beauty that people have enjoyed in the past. The desired condition is for a recreation setting to provide a sense of undisturbed naturalness with limited interactions between or disturbances from overnight campers on the lakeshore.

Some of the dispersed campsites or popular day use areas may be important waterfowl, shore bird, and neotropical land bird nesting areas, wetland feeding areas or hiding places for species specifically tied to these environments. In high use areas, dispersed camping and day use activities are causing loss of vegetative cover, soil compaction and to some extent bank erosion. Recreational use on islands disturbs nesting waterfowl, shore birds, and neotropical migrant birds that might otherwise choose islands for security from terrestrial predators or for key vegetation habitat characteristics.

The desired conditions are a natural setting for recreation use that has minimal disturbances and limited interactions between parties of overnight campers along the lakeshore and protection of wetland and wildlife habitat areas that are important to the ecosystem at Hosmer Lake.

B. Management Direction

As described earlier, management activities in the Hosmer Lake area are guided by the Deschutes National Forest Plan as amended by the Northwest Forest Plan, and by policy and direction found in Forest Service Regulations which are implemented in the form of direction from line officers such as the Chief of the Forest Service, Regional Forester, Forest Supervisor or District Ranger. A brief summary of the various components of the management direction for the area follows.

Forest Plans

The Northwest Forest Plan establishes land allocations and overlays with overriding standards and

guidelines to those of the Deschutes Forest Plan. However, in some of the allocations the NWFP defers to standards and guidelines of the Deschutes Forest Plan. A detailed description of the applicable Standards and Guidelines are included in [Appendix A](#).

The Hosmer Lake project area lies within an Administratively Withdrawn allocation under the Northwest Forest Plan. This means that, with the exception of Riparian Reserve Standards and Guidelines, the Northwest Forest Plan for the most part defers to the Deschutes National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan's direction to those lands. Those portions of the project area adjacent to the lake and streams (including most of both campgrounds) lies within a Riparian Reserve, which then provides additional direction on the goals and objectives for long-term management of the area.

Regulations

Forest Service Manuals and Handbooks provide management direction for broad program areas such as Recreation Management and the implementing regulations of the National Environmental Policy Act. Forest Service Manuals and Handbooks provide specific direction for the management of National Forest campgrounds, and guidance in areas such as hazard tree designation. The Pacific Northwest Region of the Forest Service has also adopted the Region Six Hazard Tree Handbook to guide the designation of hazard trees consistent with Forest Service safety policies.

Line Officer Direction

Line Officers are responsible for implementing decisions in accordance with laws, national policy, and procedures. They have discretion to establish local direction for actions within their authority consistent with their responsibilities. The District Ranger, as a result of the public concern about the management of hazard trees within the Hosmer Lake Campgrounds, developed a district process for involving the public in the decisions on the treatment of hazard trees. The process emphasizes protection of the natural character of the campgrounds in the face of epidemic levels of mortality, and involves consistent with public safety - taking a cautious approach to the treatment of hazard trees and the removal of down wood resulting in the campgrounds. The process has been in place since May 1999. Much of the process is based on advice received from the Deschutes Provincial Advisory Committee. The advice focused on increasing the public's involvement in decisions the Forest Service must make about the Hosmer Lake Campground environment and increasing the Forest Service's awareness of the value of those resources to many of the people that cherish Hosmer Lake. The process is implemented when selecting treatment options for hazard trees, providing an opportunity for the public to comment on those treatment selections. A detailed description of that process is included in [Appendix B](#).

C. Proposed Action

The purpose of these proposed actions is to reduce the effects of human impacts to wetland and wildlife habitats, and, within that context, to provide a recreation setting consistent with the long term management goals of Hosmer Lake. The proposed action would achieve these goals by:

- Providing parking facilities outside of sensitive wetland areas.
- Providing an accessible toilet facility.
- Locating dispersed camping zones away from fragile wetland and riparian wildlife habitat.
- Restoring wetland areas impacted by human use to native vegetation and reducing or eliminating human use impacts.

The proposed action is described in detail in Alternative 2. The Proposed Action is the same proposal identified as the selected Alternative in the Cascades Lakes Environmental Assessment EA, with the exclusion of active vegetation management within the campground areas and a change from a system of proposed designated dispersed sites to a proposal for identifying specific areas, or zones, where dispersed camping would be allowed. The reasons for these changes are described in Section V, Alternatives Considered but Eliminated.

D. Decision to Be Made:

The Deciding Officer is the Bend/Ft. Rock District Ranger. The decision is whether to authorize the actions proposed in this Environmental Assessment, and if so, under what conditions.

[Figure 2: Hosmer Lake Existing Conditions.](#)

GOTO

- [Chapter I](#)
- [Chapter II](#)
- [Chapter III](#)
- [Chapter IV](#)
- [Chapter V](#)
- [Chapter VI](#)
- [Chapter VII](#)
- [Chapter VIII](#)
- [Appendix A](#)
- [Appendix B](#)
- [Appendix C](#)
- [Appendix D](#)
- [Appendix E](#)
- [Appendix F](#)

- [Appendix G](#)
 - [Appendix H](#)
 - [Appendix I](#)
-

[Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests Website](#)

<http://www.fs.fed.us/centraloregon/manageinfo/nepa/documents/bendfort/hosmer/chapter2.html>

Last Update: 6/8/01

R.A. Jensen

HOSMER LAKE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVISION TO THE CASCADE LAKES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

III. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

A. Scoping

Scoping is a process by which the Deciding Officer determines the scope of the environmental effects of the Proposed Action and Alternatives to the proposed action. This includes contact with and involvement of interested and affected groups, individuals, and other governmental entities. It also includes a process of determining the specific focus of any given range of actions to be considered in a given decision. The focus for the scope of the analysis is dependent upon the purpose and need for the proposed action and the information and resources available to the Deciding Officer to make a reasoned decision.

In response to an appeal of the Cascade Lakes Restoration EA, the District Ranger intensified efforts to work more closely with individuals and groups with primary concerns regarding the management of campground areas in developed and dispersed settings. A great deal of time was spent at the site discussing these concerns (see [Appendix E](#)).

These efforts included providing staff support to a working group and subcommittee of a federal advisory committee, and numerous site visits to identify issues and recommend solutions. Although some of the issues raised were determined to be outside of the scope of this environmental assessment, efforts to recommend solutions will continue through other measures or subsequent analyses (see also [Appendix D](#)).

In 1998, the Field Ranger Program, a pilot program on the Bend-Ft. Rock Ranger District, provided an opportunity to more effectively reach many of the users of Hosmer Lake. Listening to public concerns about proposed actions and getting a sense of how to resolve some of the resource and recreation management issues have been a primary focus of this program.

In addition to field visits and contacts, the District has generated a mailing list of over 240 groups and individuals interested in being kept apprised of the project. These interested parties have received copies of the original letter describing the proposed action, subsequent mailings regarding ongoing maintenance activities if they expressed a specific interest, and a preliminary draft of the alternatives for comment prior to finalizing the alternatives included in the final Environmental Assessment.

B. Summary of Scoping Comments

Written and oral comments on the proposed action provided the basis for the Issues described below. There were a total of 113 letters, e-mail, or oral comments received between 1998 and 1999 concerning the proposed actions and the management of the Hosmer Lake area. These resulted in approximately 80 comments that the interdisciplinary team reviewed to determine whether they were within the scope of the decision to be made. See [Appendix C](#) for a summary of comments received on this project.

C. Additional Public Comment

In addition to the scoping process, there were two opportunities for public comment on the proposed action and alternatives. The alternatives were sent out for a brief review to those who had indicated an interest, and the final Environmental Assessment will be available for a 30-day comment period.

D. Issues

Numerous comments were made about conditions in or around Hosmer Lake. Not all of those comments have been addressed in detail in this analysis. Comments that were determined to be outside of the scope of this analysis, or not relevant to the decision to be made are discussed in detail in [Appendix C](#). It is important to note that some of the comments outside the scope of this analysis have been addressed in other forums, such as the hazard tree and down wood process for the Hosmer Lake Campgrounds, the Field Ranger program, and monitoring of use levels and activities on and around the lake.

The scope of the proposed action was limited to those actions and decisions outlined in the purpose and need and proposed action. Those issues concerning the physical, biological or social effects of the proposed action are addressed in detail below. Those issues generally either contributed to the development of alternatives to the proposed action, implementation requirements across all alternatives, or were used in the comparison of effects of the alternatives.

Each of the written comments was reviewed and oral comments were documented. The comments were then grouped and similar comments summarized to facilitate response to those comments in one of the forms described above. The comments have been grouped into two categories: 1) Facility Function and, 2) Recreation Experience, Wetland Recovery & Wildlife Habitat. Facility Function will address parking, circulation and accessibility issues, and recreation experience concerns. Recreation Experience, Wetland Recovery & Wildlife Habitat will address dispersed camping, use of the islands, and disturbance to wetland vegetation and wildlife. These issues will be used throughout the analysis to describe and compare the alternatives.

1. Facility Function: Parking and Circulation

- a. The proposed parking area and accessible toilet area would eliminate two

overnight campground sites. The campground is typically full to capacity on peak weekends.

Measures: Number of campsites in South Campground

b. Vehicles with boat trailers cause crowding at the boat ramp parking area, and along the main road, especially during peak periods of use

Measures: Crowding at boat ramp (to be determined by use sampling and visitor comments), space available for parking along the road.

c. The proposed parking area would increase traffic through the campground and increase dust and noise to the campground users

Measures: Estimated number of vehicles in new parking areas that would travel through campground.

2. Recreation Experience, Wetland & Wildlife Habitat: Dispersed Camping

a. The proposed dispersed use camping permit system, including the proposed parking lot signs and brochure may attract more users to venture onto Hosmer Lake and may increase dispersed use camping because of the written publicity.

Measures: Type and intent of brochures and informational signing, amount and type of public comments collected.

b. Registration with the campground host for use of overnight-dispersed campsites imposes an unwelcome feeling of control that has not been present in the past at Hosmer. The enforcement of the dispersed site permit system by the campground host may not be practical or convenient for campers.

Measures: Level of convenience/impacts to users, level of disturbance from numerous camps with and without permit system.

c. Specific zones for dispersed use camping may, over the long term, degrade the existing condition of wetland vegetation and wildlife habitat.

Measures: Estimates of wetland conditions in zoned areas over time; potential for new sites to be developed over time.

d. Eliminating all use of the islands would affect the recreational experience of many of the users of Hosmer Lake. Some dispute the degree that human use affects the actual use of the islands by birds.

Measures: Islands open or closed to use/use level monitoring.

e. Existing dispersed camping and other recreational activities within 1/4 mile (1/2 mile line-of-sight) of nesting bald eagles may affect success of foraging areas. Disturbance of the nest site or of the foraging area (i.e. lake proper, including islands) are both of concern.

Measures: Nest site productivity (i.e. young per year) compared to average productivity. Amount and location of overnight camping and/or day use activities. Number of boats on the lake during the nesting season.

Alternatives Considered in Detail

1. Common to All Alternatives

The Proposed Action and Alternatives (including No Action) that were considered in detail contain several common components. These components incorporate relevant higher-level plans by reference. These higher-level plans have already established the general, overall goals for the area. For the benefit of the readers, and to help address issues that have been discussed with the public and the Deschutes Provincial Advisory Committee, those long-term management goals are described below. In addition, the long-term monitoring goals for the campground and surrounding areas are also described.

Long Term Goals

Broad goals for the management of recreation sites within Riparian Reserves are described in the Northwest Forest Plan, and the Deschutes Forest Plan and Forest Service Recreation Management Manuals and Handbooks establish other goals.

Public opinion strongly supports people's love of the peace and solitude offered by Hosmer Lake, and the overall management of the campground and the areas around them has generally been reflective of that in the past. Changes in both the vegetation and social conditions make the need to clarify and strengthen specific long-term management goals important.

Long-term goals for Hosmer Lake are established by considering the landscape character and desired recreational setting and experience. The desired recreational setting is reflected in the overall development level of facilities. The development level for facilities at Hosmer is Level 3 - Moderately Modified (see Appendix H). The Deschutes National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan

through the use of the Recreational Opportunity Spectrum (ROS) have broadly outlined the desired recreational setting at Hosmer Lake. The ROS setting for Hosmer Lake is Roded Natural in the campground areas, and Semi-Primitive Non-Motorized on the lake and in along the eastern shores. The eastern shores lie within the West, Southwest Mt. Bachelor roadless area identified in Appendix C of the Deschutes National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan. Hosmer Lake has been used as fishery lake since the 1930s, and as an Atlantic salmon fishery since their introduction and the installation of the dam in 1958.

Consistent with the ROS setting, the development of the campgrounds has been minimal, the boat ramp, toilet and campground facilities are rustic, and no water or electricity is provided. The lake is electric motor only, fly-fishing, catch-and-release for Atlantic salmon, and a 5/day harvest for brook trout, and favors canoe and float-tube use. There is limited access to the lake except via the boat ramp at South Campground or an undeveloped canoe launch at Mallard Marsh Campground because of the extensive wetland vegetation around the lake and the roadless area on the opposite side of the lake. The users of the lake and the campgrounds value peace and quiet, pristine views, solitude, and natural settings.

As described earlier, the specific goals of long-term management of the resources at Hosmer Lake would be to:

- Maintain or improve the recreation experience that our visitors have come to know and enjoy.
- Prevent damage to wetland and wildlife habitats.
- Restore wetland and wildlife habitats damaged by human use.

Riparian Reserve Management

The Hosmer Lake Campgrounds, as mentioned before, fall largely within an area known as a Riparian Reserve under the Northwest Forest Plan. The Riparian Reserve around Hosmer Lake includes everything within 300 feet of the ordinary high water mark. This is displayed on the "Hosmer Lake Plan Allocations" map. Not all of the land within the Riparian Reserve is also considered wetland or riparian vegetation, however. Human use within these areas is allowed when such use does not prevent or retard attainment of the Aquatic Conservation Strategy Objectives. The Northwest Forest Plan also recognizes importance of public safety in developed recreational facilities and along transportation corridors. All areas within the Riparian Reserves would be managed in a way to assure consistency with the Northwest Forest Plan.

Campsite Sprawl and Restoration

As a part of ongoing campground maintenance, individual sites within the campgrounds are evaluated periodically to monitor the physical extent and location of each site in regards to riparian vegetation. This evaluation could result in minor modifications to existing site boundaries, relocation of fire rings, picnic tables, or available tent sites. Each campsite is expected to accommodate an amount of use commensurate with generally no more than two vehicles, and in such a manner that allows for screening

from neighboring sites wherever natural vegetation can be established. This does not include screening from the roadbeds. Native vegetation would be restored to areas determined to be excess of camping needs by natural restoration methods coupled with down wood, planting, or seeding with native vegetation as opportunities for different methods present themselves. Desirable trails are identified and maintained, and others are obliterated through planting or down wood location. Soil compaction associated with the roadbeds and campsites would be expected, but identified areas outside of those are treated as part of ongoing campground maintenance.

Road Maintenance

Access to the boat ramp and campgrounds is designed to provide safe, convenient, and accessible travel routes for vehicles with car top boats and boat trailers. The road would be designed and maintained to minimize sediment into the lake. This would be accomplished by raising the entire road length above ground level so that would continually force the water out to the ground on either side of the road. At the bottom of the grade, all surfaced areas would be drained to the vegetated area to each side of the parking area. Proposed riparian vegetation restoration at the parking area will provide for filtering of road sediments, oils, greases and other pollutants.

Human Use Monitoring

In order to determine the effectiveness of dispersed camping management decisions, identify the size and composition of user groups on the lake, and assess the impacts of the changes in numbers of visitors to Hosmer Lake, uses at the Lake would be monitored for three consecutive years. Specific monitoring tasks are identified in [Appendix F](#).

Campground Down Wood Monitoring

In order to determine the effectiveness of current management direction concerning hazard tree and down wood treatments within the campgrounds in meeting long-term management goals for the campgrounds, a multi-year monitoring program using photo series of selected sites would be completed. See [Appendix B](#) for specific tasks.

Field Ranger Program

To provide information and conservation education materials to the public, conduct use sampling and to monitor dispersed camping compliance, Field Rangers will emphasize a presence at Hosmer Lake. Field Rangers will inform and educate visitors to Hosmer about the new changes.

Alternative 1 - No Action

The No Action alternative is intended to provide a baseline for comparison of a continuation of the

existing condition without the effects of the proposed action.

1. Facility Function: Parking and Circulation

Currently, all parking for the boat ramp is directly adjacent to the launch area. Capacity of the parking area can be affected by the water level in the lake. There is generally about a 55' X 180' area available for parking. Although there has been no delineation for specific numbers of vehicles, it is estimated that about 22 vehicles without boat trailers would fit using current parking standards. There are no barriers, striping, or other mechanisms of designating parking within the boat ramp areas. There is no regulation of parking outside of the boat ramp parking area, and when the boat ramp parking area is full, visitors park along the boat ramp access and main road. Within the boat ramp parking area, there is no designated traffic flow pattern. The nearest toilet is uphill from the boat ramp parking area, accessible only by the access road and a narrow trail without surfacing. The toilet is an old-style vault with narrow doors and limited space inside, and therefore does not meet American with Disabilities Act standards (ADA).

2. Recreation Experience, Wetland & Wildlife Habitat: Dispersed Camping

Currently, there are approximately 13 dispersed overnight sites along the shorelines of the lake and on the islands. Exact use occupancy rates are uncertain, but estimates from some limited sampling puts them around 29% (see Tables 1 & 2). Though dispersed camping sampling is limited at this point, indications are that use is growing just as they are at other dispersed areas on the Forest and in the developed campgrounds around Hosmer Lake.

[Figure 3: Alternative 1 - No Action: Boat Ramp Parking.](#)

Table 1: Approximate Number of Dispersed Campsites by Location.

Quinn Creek	Upper Lake	Outlet Pond
1	6	6

Table 2: Results of Random Sampling at Dispersed Campsites for 1998.

Sample Points	% of Sample	Total Use
Outlet Zone	59	128
Point Zone (Upper Lake)	41	81
	100	209
209/12 (days sampled) = 17.4 (ave./people/day) = 2,436 (approx. 29% occupancy) X 140 (days in season)		

Camping Permit

There are no permits or other registration required for overnight dispersed camping.

Informational Signing

There is currently no specific policy concerning dispersed uses at Hosmer Lake, nor are there any educational or informational guides about the sensitivity or ecological importance of the resources around the lake. There is no map of dispersed sites available to the public on-site. Use and development of suitable dispersed sites is currently at the user's discretion.

Campfire Restrictions

Currently, there is a temporary ban on campfires outside of developed sites around the lake due to the heavy concentrations of down and dead standing lodgepole pine.

Islands

There are currently no restrictions on or regulation of use on the islands. Most islands receive some day use; some islands receive some overnight use. Impacts to vegetation and other resources occurs from foot traffic, fire rings and human waste on the northern most island

Mitigation Measures and Management Practices Common to All Action Alternatives

- a. To reduce the hazard to the public associated with Road 4625 and to reduce the potential for overcrowding within the lake and campground, following the completion of the new parking area, parking along the entrance road to the Hosmer Lake boat ramp would be prohibited. Signs identifying the no parking area would be plainly posted along with directional signs, augmented with barriers to prevent parking.
- b. Limit times and periods of parking area construction to minimize disturbance to recreationists and water quality.
- c. To protect water quality, Best Management Practices identified in Appendix G would be used during construction activities.
- d. To protect native plant populations, and reduce the risk of noxious weed infestations, machinery used for parking area construction would be required to meet standard cleaning practices identified in Appendix F. Use of weed-free gravel would be encouraged, although there is no mechanism for testing surfacing used at this time. Monitoring of

introduced gravel would be conducted as described in Appendix F. Individual plants found following construction would be identified, mapped, and pulled.

e. To ensure use levels are not escalated by the proposed actions, additional special use requests for Hosmer Lake would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis. New applicants for uses at the Lake would have to demonstrate a public need for additional services as a part of their applications.

Alternative 2 - Proposed Action

Facility Function: Parking and Circulation

The proposed actions would reduce impacts to wetland, riparian, habitats and shoreline integrity by increasing the extent of those habitats and reducing human incursions into those habitats. Accessibility of the current launching and toilet facilities would be improved by changing the location, surfacing, and gradient of the primary parking area and the proximity and size of the toilet to that parking area.

Boat Ramp Parking Area

The existing parking lot adjacent to the boat ramp would be redesigned to exclude seasonally flooded areas. Parking spaces would be defined within the parking area and limited to the south side of the existing area. Parking capacity would be reduced to an area approximately 55' X 81' (approx. .10 acres). This is estimated to reduce the parking of the boat ramp area by about 10 cars. Riparian habitat (areas of seasonal flooding) in the parking lot adjacent to the boat ramp would be restored to native vegetation. In the areas to be restored, the existing gravel surface would be removed, the underlying soil loosened, and the area revegetated through planting or natural revegetation. Barriers of rock, wood, or other materials consistent with the landscape character would be used to prevent damage to vegetation. NOTE: Grasses and sedges are recovering naturally in the area that's already been closed to parking. Removal of gravel may not be necessary.

Upper Parking Area

To accommodate the reduction in size of the existing lot and loss of parking along the entrance road, a new parking lot would be placed adjacent to the existing toilet facility, within campsites # 21 and 23 in South Campground. Eleven parking spaces would be provided in the new parking lot, one being reserved for disabled persons.

Toilet Facility

The existing toilet facility would be nearby the former campsite areas converted to parking. During parking area construction, an accessible toilet facility would be installed at the same location as the current facility, and a path approximately 3-4' wide with a gentle grade would be cleared and surfaced

with a resistant material to meet ADA standards for accessibility.

Recreation Experience, Wetland & Wildlife Habitat: Dispersed Camping

Sensitive and unique wetlands and riparian habitats occur around the lake. A rich variety of wildlife and plant species occupy these areas, including some uncommon and rare species. Direct impacts to vegetation, wet soils and shoreline banks, and the indirect effects of disturbance to wildlife from recreationists would be reduced in this alternative.

Dispersed Camping

This alternative would limit additional uncontrolled overnight dispersed camping by establishing zones within which a specified number of sites would be permitted. The zones and number of sites per zone were established based on the availability of suitable areas for campsites that would not otherwise cause damage to important wetland and wildlife habitats or shoreline integrity. The level of social interaction commensurate with a semi-primitive recreational experience was also considered in determining the appropriate number of sites per zone.

Overnight camping would be allowed only in three designated zones with a limited number of campsites within each zone (see "Hosmer Lake Alternative 2" map). There would be a total of eight camping opportunities in three zones. The total number of known camping sites would be reduced from thirteen to eight.

Table 3: Alternative 2 - Number of Dispersed Campsites by Zone.

Quinn Creek	Upper Lake	Outlet Pond
1 campsite per night	3 campsites per night	4 campsites per night

Five dispersed camping sites outside the designated zones would be permanently closed and restored to native vegetation either by natural encroachment or planting. Campsites that would be closed would be temporarily (estimated for three years) marked with a small but clearly visible sign. Material of the signs may vary, but would be designed to fit the recreational setting and be long-lasting.

[Figure 4: Alternative 2 - Proposed Action: Dispersed Camp Zones.](#)

[Figure 5: Alternative 2 - Proposed Action: Parking Design.](#)

Dispersed Camping Permit

Visitors would be required to register with the Mallard Marsh Campground Host in order to camp at any of the three dispersed camping zones. The Campground Host would assign campers to the zones on a

first-come, first-serve basis. A sign describing the permit process would be posted in both boat ramp-parking areas to notify visitors of the permit requirement.

Visitors would receive a brochure with a map delineating the three camping zones on Hosmer Lake. The campers would be advised of the number of permitted sites in each zone and the Campground Host would identify an available zone with the campers, who would then select a camp within that zone when they arrive on-site. The Forest Service would not designate individual sites. The brochure would serve as the permit to camp, and would provide stewardship and wetland ecology information. It would also explain the purpose of the permit camping system and the importance of wetland and wildlife habitat protection to maintain the long-term beauty and diversity of Hosmer Lake.

Informational Signing

A sign describing the permit system would be posted in the boat ramp parking area.

Campfires in Dispersed Sites/Islands

Campfires outside of developed sites are permitted in accordance with other National Forest requirements. During fire season, campfires are permitted in an area cleared to mineral soil. Campfires may be restricted or prohibited during high and extreme fire danger when Public Use Restrictions are in place.

Islands

To reduce disturbance to nesting waterfowl, shore bird, and neotropical migrant bird habitat the islands within Hosmer Lake would be closed to the public for both day use and overnight camping. Restoration of native vegetation and shoreline structure would be required on some of the islands to improve nesting habitat conditions that have been impacted by human use.

Alternative 3

Alternative 3 represents one response to the issues raised during scoping - primarily the issues of the elimination of existing campsites within the South Campground for the construction of the parking area, and the management of dispersed camping in the area. This alternative incorporates those portions of the PAC recommendations determined by the Deciding Officer to be relevant to and within the scope of the decision to be made as a result of this analysis. The alternative was developed to be responsive to suggested changes to the proposed action that would meet the purpose and need.

Alternative 3 proposes a different approach to the placement of the parking area and the designation and registration of dispersed overnight campsites. The objectives of the facility improvements proposed with this alternative would be to restore the riparian habitat damaged by parking, relieve parking congestion at the boat ramp, provide accessible parking and restroom facilities. The objectives for management of

dispersed camping would include control of dispersed camping to protect sensitive riparian habitat and prevent establishment of dispersed campsites in inappropriate areas and allow damaged habitat to recover. Fire danger from dispersed camping sources would be reduced.

Facility Function: Parking and Circulation

Boat Ramp Parking Area

The existing parking area would be designed as in Alternative 2. In addition, the parking area would be signed "no boat trailer parking". The southwest side of the existing boat ramp parking lot would be signed "head in parking only" (see "Hosmer Lake Alternative 3" map). In the area to be restored, the existing gravel surface would be removed, the underlying soil loosened, and the area would be revegetated with native plants. In the area southeast of the concrete boat ramp (between the topped snag and the lake) parking would be prohibited.

Upper Parking Area

This alternative would allow for construction of a new parking lot for vehicles with boat trailers. The new lot would be built at the top of the hill above the campground in the northeast quadrant of the intersection between road 4625 and the boat ramp access road (see "Hosmer Lake Alternative 3" map). The lot would have 10 spaces, each large enough for a vehicle and boat trailer and be approximately 220' x 100' (approx. 0.5 acres). In addition, there would be one single-car parking space reserved for use by disabled persons. The parking lot surface would be gravel and traffic would be one-way in and one-way out. Vegetation screens would be left where possible between the parking lot and the toilet, access roads, and campgrounds.

Toilet Facilities

Under this alternative, the existing toilet facilities near the boat ramp would be reconstructed or replaced with new facilities meeting ADA standards. A trail meeting those standards would be constructed from the new parking lot downhill to the toilet.

[Figure 6: Alternative 3 - Dispersed Camping.](#)

[Figure 7: Alternative 3 - Parking Design.](#)

Recreation Experience, Wetland & Wildlife Habitat: Dispersed Camping

Dispersed Camping

This alternative would reduce existing dispersed camping levels with a low-visibility system of marking

all areas closed that are not approved sites. A total of six sites would be approved in the three main use areas.

Table 4: Alternative 3 - Number of Dispersed Campsites (No Zones).

Quinn River	Upper Lake	Outlet Pond
1	3	2

Existing sites to be closed would be posted with small, inconspicuous signs reading "No Camping - Area Closed."

Camping Permit

This approach taken with Alternative 3 would be similar to the overall approach currently taken on the Deschutes National Forest regarding dispersed camping. Overnight camping would be permitted unless posted otherwise. No camping permit or registration would be required. In Alternative 3, however, users would be asked - by Field Rangers and campground personnel - to limit their use to "approved" dispersed campsites. Users would identify the "approved sites" by the site conditions. The approved sites would be obvious campsites, dry, flat devegetated areas where tents have been set regularly. Users would identify where not to camp by small, inconspicuous signs prohibiting camping where unapproved sites have been identified. No maps would be available to identify the location of approved sites.

Informational Signing

Under this alternative, informational or interpretive signing would be emphasized where dispersed closures are in force. No informational signing about dispersed campsites would be displayed.

Campfires

To reduce the potential for an escaped fire to cause catastrophic damage to the Hosmer Lake environs, campfires would be prohibited at all times in all dispersed campsites around Hosmer Lake. A conspicuous sign advising campers of this regulation would be posted at the boat ramp.

Islands

Alternative 3 would be the same as Alternative 2 with additional posting and monitoring recommended by the Deschutes Provincial Advisory Committee. Alternative 3 would close the islands in Hosmer Lake to public entry and post them with low, inconspicuous signs identifying the purpose of the closure as well as the closure notification. This alternative would include monitoring to determine whether the closures divert recreational use to other sensitive riparian areas.

Alternative 4

Overall, public comments and concerns about the proposed action focused mainly on the social aspects of changes in use regulation, or the changes in the campground resulting from the proposed placement of the new parking lot. While Alternative 3 was developed in response to many of those public comments, it was also designed to include specific elements of the public advisory committee's recommendations. Not in all cases were those recommendations also responsive to some of the other issues raised by the public, such as use of the islands, or concerns over the reduction in numbers of sites where dispersed camping would be permitted. Alternative 4 blends recommendations from the PAC with actions responsive to those public comments.

Alternative 4 includes all of the elements of the proposed parking layout and design of Alternative 3, and combines elements of the dispersed site management proposal of both Alternatives 2 and 3. This alternative would close the northernmost island to public use for at least 5 years and apply a seasonal restriction to the other islands.

Facility Function: Parking and Circulation

These would all be the same as Alternative 3.

Recreation Experience, Wetland & Wildlife Habitat: Dispersed Camping

Dispersed Camping

Alternative 4 would reduce the emphasis on permitted camping, but retain the concept of "designated zones" to support monitoring and enforcement efforts. There would be a total of 8 campsites available, the same as in Alternative 2. Table 5 and "Hosmer Lake Alternative 3" map identify the zones and number of approved campsites per zone.

Table 5: Alternative 4 - Number of Dispersed Campsites by Zone.

Quinn Creek	Upper Lake	Outlet Pond
1	3	4

The area available to dispersed camping and the number of sites within each zone would be identified on a map or brochure available at the upper and lower boat ramp parking areas, through field rangers and campground employees. Closed sites or newly developed, inappropriate, sites within approved zones would be rehabilitated and then posted closed if needed.

[Figure 8: Alternative 4 - Dispersed Camping Zones.](#)

[Figure 9: Alternative 4 - Parking Design.](#)

Dispersed Camping Permit

There would be no permit or registration required for campsites. Use of the designated number of campsites within each zone would rely strongly on the honor system, and the posting of closed areas. Designation of specific zones for camping and recommended numbers within those zones would provide users with guidelines for appropriate location and site densities.

Informational Signing

Alternative 4 would focus informational and interpretive signing at the parking areas. Themes would include the value and sensitivity of the special and unique areas around Hosmer Lake. Alternative 4, as described above, would make available to the public maps of the locations of dispersed camping zones and information about the numbers of sites within those zones. To preserve the sense of discovery, locations of dispersed campsites would not be provided on the signs, although a notice that dispersed camping is allowed only in designated zones would be posted.

Campfires in Dispersed Sites

Alternative 4 would continue the prohibition on campfires in dispersed sites until the amount of standing and dead lodgepole pine was no longer considered a significant fire danger.

Islands

There was concern raised by the public over closing of the islands. Most of those concerns were raised because the islands are part of the reason many people canoe Hosmer Lake, and partly because there is little data to support actual use levels associated with the islands as nesting habitat for some of the bird species before the area began to grow in popularity. Alternative 4 focuses protection of potential eagle nesting habitat on the northernmost island, and limits the time the island would be closed to day and overnight use to five years. The intent would be to sponsor a wildlife monitoring project that could help to determine whether reduced human use makes a difference in whether waterfowl, shore bird, or neotropical migrant bird use improves and vegetative rehabilitation is effective. Other islands within Hosmer Lake would be seasonally restricted for day use, and closed to overnight use. As described in the Deschutes Land and Resource Management Plan, disturbing activities within 1/4 mile of an active eagle nest site will be restricted. Therefore, day use and overnight activities on the islands fall into the seasonal restriction. The seasonal use restriction is to reduce disturbance to nesting eagles from January 1 through August 31.

GOTO

- [Chapter I](#)
- [Chapter II](#)
- [Chapter III](#)
- [Chapter IV](#)
- [Chapter V](#)
- [Chapter VI](#)
- [Chapter VII](#)
- [Chapter VIII](#)
- [Appendix A](#)
- [Appendix B](#)
- [Appendix C](#)
- [Appendix D](#)
- [Appendix E](#)
- [Appendix F](#)
- [Appendix G](#)
- [Appendix H](#)
- [Appendix I](#)

[Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests Website](#)

<http://www.fs.fed.us/centraloregon/manageinfo/nepa/documents/bendfort/hosmer/chapter3.html>

Last Update: 6/8/01

R.A. Jensen

HOSMER LAKE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVISION TO THE CASCADE LAKES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

IV. Comparison of Alternatives

This section compares the alternatives according to their differences relating to the issues identified earlier.

Table 6: Alternatives Compared.

Issue	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4
<i>Facility Function: Parking and Accessible Toilet</i>				
Boat Ramp Parking Area	Total parking spaces approx. 22; portions of parking area seasonally flooded.	Parking moved out of seasonal flooding area, 12 spaces remain; barriers installed along seasonal flood line all the way to ramp.	Parking moved out of riparian area 12 spaces remains; head-in parking only; no boat trailer parking; log barrier only to be used to provide a 50' opening between ramp and parking area for boat loading area (i.e. no parking).	Parking moved out of seasonal flooding area; 12 spaces remain; barriers of various materials installed along seasonal flood line; 50' opening between barrier and ramp for boat loading.
Upper Parking Area	No new parking areas designated, parking continues along 4625 when existing parking is full.	New parking lot constructed 11 spaces in two existing campground sites.	New parking lot constructed 11 spaces in new location between road 4625 and campground.	New parking lot constructed 11 spaces in new location between road 4625 and campground.
Other Parking	Parking along Road 4625 and the boat ramp access road.	No parking along 4625 or boat ramp access road.	No parking along 4625 or boat ramp access road.	No parking along 4625 or boat ramp access road.
<i>Recreation Experience: Wetland & Wildlife Habitat</i>				

Dispersed Camping Sites	No regulation of 13 sites.	8 total sites, designated by zone; locations signed at boat ramp & brochures; permits required.	6 total sites, designated by signing where not to camp; no permits.	8 total sites, designated by zones; location signed at boat ramp & brochures; no permits.
Informational Signing	None.	Both parking areas have sign describing permit process. Brochures include ecology of area.	None.	Informational & interpretive at parking areas identifying dispersed camping zones and ecology of area. Brochures include ecology of area.
Campfire Restrictions	All campfires in dispersed camps temporarily prohibited.	Campfires permitted in accordance with Forest-wide regulations.	All campfires in dispersed camps prohibited.	Campfires prohibited until change in conditions.
Islands	Open to day and overnight use.	Closed to day and overnight use.	Closed to day and overnight use.	Northernmost closed to all use for 5-year study. No overnight use and seasonal restriction on day use (1/1 through 8/31) for all other islands.

GOTO

- [Chapter I](#)
- [Chapter II](#)
- [Chapter III](#)
- Chapter IV
- [Chapter V](#)
- [Chapter VI](#)

- [Chapter VII](#)
- [Chapter VIII](#)
- [Appendix A](#)
- [Appendix B](#)
- [Appendix C](#)
- [Appendix D](#)
- [Appendix E](#)
- [Appendix F](#)
- [Appendix G](#)
- [Appendix H](#)
- [Appendix I](#)

[Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests Website](#)

<http://www.fs.fed.us/centraloregon/manageinfo/nepa/documents/bendfort/hosmer/chapter4.html>

Last Update: 6/8/01

R.A. Jensen

HOSMER LAKE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVISION TO THE CASCADE LAKES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

V. Alternatives Considered But Eliminated

The process of developing alternatives to be considered in detail includes a process of eliminating alternatives, or parts of alternatives, that were considered or proposed in some detail in the process, but that were not carried through in the final analysis. The following includes a brief description of alternatives that were not considered in detail, and the rationale for not carrying those alternatives further.

A. Vegetation Management

The Cascades Lakes Restoration EA proposed a variety of vegetation treatments in the Hosmer Lake campgrounds to reduce the susceptibility of the existing large diameter (i.e., greater than or equal to 8" diameter at breast height) lodgepole pine component in the campground and reduce the fuel loading and fire hazard. This vegetation management proposal, and the overall management of hazard trees within the campground areas became the focus of intense public comment, and primary points of appeal. Following the appeal on the Cascades Lakes Restoration EA, agreements could not be easily reached on the effectiveness of proposed treatments, and a critical time in the evolution of the mountain pine beetle epidemic in the large diameter trees of the campground was missed. Additional efforts at this time to improve the resistance of those large diameter trees through stand density reduction would not be likely to demonstrate the long term benefits in relation to the short term esthetic impacts that would have been realized at the time of the original decision. New condition evaluations will be needed, and a different approach to the current and future vegetative condition must be developed to respond to those changed conditions. That analysis could not be supported with funds available for this decision. Therefore, with the exception of restoring native vegetation within the riparian area, no alternatives were evaluated concerning the long-term vegetation condition goals of the campground, or of the area immediately surrounding the Hosmer Lake area.

B. No Fees in the Campground

A number of respondents raised the issue of the relationship of fees charged in a recreation area to the liability of the entity responsible for the maintenance of that recreation facility. Although subject to legal interpretation, generally speaking, under Oregon State Law, the owner of a recreation facility may not be held liable for personal or property injuries or death resulting from the free use by the public of such a facility. Charging a fee for the public to use such a facility changes the owner's liability under Oregon

law. Regardless of Oregon law, the Forest Service has an obligation to manage its campgrounds in a manner that promotes public safety. (See Forest Service Manual 2332.1 - 2332.12)

Hosmer Lake is a special place for thousands of people that visit each year. The Forest Service has undertaken an obligation to provide a safe and appropriate setting for the public to enjoy for generations to come. That obligation includes treatment and removal of hazard trees within the campgrounds as a part of the annual maintenance program. That maintenance is essential to the safe operation and public use of the campground. In addition, the fee structure of the campground, and whether the campgrounds would continue operation is outside the scope of the proposed action, purpose and need, and decision to be made. Therefore, that proposal was not considered in detail in this analysis.

C. Close All Dispersed Sites

An alternative that would eliminate all dispersed camping to reduce impacts to wildlife habitat effectiveness was considered to be unnecessarily restrictive when considering the level of use currently occurring within those habitats, and the changes included in the proposed action and other alternatives. Under current use levels, dispersed campsites on the shoreline have caused minor negative impacts to riparian habitats and soils. However, use on island habitats are of greater significance because of their small size and uniqueness. Future monitoring will determine the trends of impacts to habitats and its significance to wildlife species.

D. Add Developed Sites to the Campground

Several respondents were concerned that the parking area in the proposed action would eliminate developed campsites in an area they felt was seeing increases in public use. Instead, many suggested, the Forest Service should look at expanding the campgrounds. This issue is clearly of importance as more and more recreational pressure is felt in campgrounds. However, expanding campground capacity would require a more extensive analysis than replacement of a boat ramp, parking area and toilet facility, and is not within the scope of the proposed action.

GOTO

- [Chapter I](#)
- [Chapter II](#)
- [Chapter III](#)
- [Chapter IV](#)
- Chapter V

- [Chapter VI](#)
- [Chapter VII](#)
- [Chapter VIII](#)
- [Appendix A](#)
- [Appendix B](#)
- [Appendix C](#)
- [Appendix D](#)
- [Appendix E](#)
- [Appendix F](#)
- [Appendix G](#)
- [Appendix H](#)
- [Appendix I](#)

[Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests Website](#)

<http://www.fs.fed.us/centraloregon/manageinfo/nepa/documents/bendfort/hosmer/chapter5.html>

Last Update: 6/8/01

R.A. Jensen

HOSMER LAKE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVISION TO THE CASCADE LAKES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

VI. Effects

This section discloses effects expected as a result of Alternative 1 (No Action), Alternative 2 (Proposed Action), Alternative 3 and Alternative 4. All action alternatives are designed to be consistent with the desired conditions described in the Deschutes National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan standards and guidelines, as well as direction found in the Standards and Guidelines for Management of Habitat for Late-Successional and Old-Growth Forest Related Species Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl (Northwest Forest Plan, NWFP) and General Water Quality Best Management Practices (BMPs).

This section provides the analytic basis for comparison of the alternatives. It also describes the effects of the alternatives, while addressing the effects on issues described on pages 8-10.

Alternative 1 - No Action

1. Facility Function: Parking and Circulation

Overnight and day use parking for the boat ramp will continue as is at the existing launch area. Crowded conditions will persist, especially on weekends and holidays. No barriers, striping, or other mechanisms to designate parking will occur at the boat ramp. Visitors will continue to park along the boat ramp and main access roads (Road 4625). The existing vault toilet will continue to be inaccessible and not meet ADA standards. Runoff will continue to occur into the lake.

2. Recreation Experience, Wetland & Wildlife Habitat: Dispersed Camping

The approximately 13 dispersed overnight sites along the shorelines of the lake and on the islands will remain open. No closures or restoration work will occur under this alternative. Dispersed camping use is expected to grow just as it is at other dispersed areas on the Forest and in the developed campgrounds around Hosmer Lake.

Camping Permit

There are no permits or other registration for overnight dispersed camping and none would be required

under this alternative. Use and development of suitable dispersed sites is currently at the user's discretion.

Informational Signing

Informational guides or signs about the sensitivity or ecological importance of the resources around the lake may occur to protect natural resources on an as needed basis. As use continues to increase, impacts from uninformed visitors could occur as they recreate at various locations on the lake. More informational material could be produced to address this use under this alternative.

Campfire Restrictions

Currently, there is a temporary ban on campfires outside of developed sites around the lake due to the heavy concentrations of down and dead standing lodgepole pine. This would continue until the fuel hazard is diminished naturally.

Islands

Most islands receive some day use; some islands receive some overnight use. This would not change under this alternative. Island vegetation and habitat would continue to be diminished as human use impacts deter eagle, waterfowl and other wildlife use of the islands. Effects from campfires would continue to impact vegetation and aesthetic resources.

Alternative 2 - Proposed Action

1. Facility Function: Parking and Circulation

The proposed actions would reduce impacts to wetland, riparian, habitats and shoreline integrity by increasing the extent and reducing human incursions into those habitats. Accessibility of the current launching and toilet facilities would be improved by changing the location, surfacing, and gradient of the primary parking and the toilet at this site.

Boat Ramp Parking Area

The reduction of the boat ramp parking area by approximately 10 cars, coupled with the "no parking" restriction along the access roads (Road 4625 & the boat ramp road) would reduce congestion at this site. Boat trailer parking would still be allowed at this site. On busy weekends and holidays, this could lead to some visitors having to go to other lakes to boat/fish/dispersed camp when the lot is full. It could also result in some day use boaters parking their vehicles in vacant campsite spurs, making the sites unavailable for camp use. This could lead to conflicts between developed campground and day users/dispersed campers.

The restoration of the riparian habitat (areas of seasonal flooding and runoff) in the parking lot adjacent to the boat ramp would improve wildlife habitat and also function better as a filter for any road pollutants and sediment that comes from the ramp and access road.

Upper Parking Area

The new 11 vehicle parking area proposed to be constructed in campsites # 21 and 23 in South Campground would eliminate these favorable sites. This could potentially increase the occupancy rates for both South and Mallard Marsh campgrounds, making them more crowded throughout the year than they are now. Currently, both are below the Deschutes Land and Resource Management Plan threshold of 40% (on average between 1994-99, the occupancy rate for South Campground is 28%, and 30% at Mallard Marsh Campground). There is also a potential that an increase in dust in the campground could occur from use of this new parking area. This would be limited to only those sites adjacent to the parking area while it is in use. However, the effect would be minimal since vehicle speeds would be very slow and most would exit via the boat ramp road and not through the campground itself.

Impacts to vegetation not currently impacted would occur with the construction of this site. There would be no effect on T, E and S (threatened, endangered, sensitive) plant or animal species. Aesthetics of the adjacent campsites would change somewhat as parked vehicles may be more obtrusive than 2 occupied campsites to some visitors. This may be more the case when the parking area is full on weekends and holidays.

Toilet Facility

The new toilet facility would be placed in the same location as the existing facility. It would meet ADA standards and provide access to both parking areas. There would be no effect on T, E and S plant or animal species from the development of new access trails to this facility.

Recreation Experience, Wetland & Wildlife Habitat: Dispersed Camping

Direct impacts to vegetation, wet soils and shoreline banks, and the indirect effects of disturbance to wildlife from recreationists would be reduced in this alternative.

Dispersed Camping

Dispersed camp zones and a specified amount of campsites per zone will limit overnight-dispersed use at Hosmer Lake (reduction from 13 to 8 dispersed campsites). However, since campsites are not designated on the ground, the possibility for new campsite development in non-impacted areas could occur in this alternative.

The five dispersed camping sites outside the designated zones that would be permanently closed and restored to native vegetation would improve the aesthetic, riparian and wildlife resources at these

locations. The temporary signs posted at these sites would inform visitors of the closure.

Dispersed Camping Permit

The requirement for visitors to register with the Mallard Marsh Campground Host in order to camp at any of the three dispersed camping zones would be an intrusive measure for most visitors who are accustomed to a less controlled environment at Hosmer. The signs describing the permit process would be posted in both boat ramp-parking areas to notify visitors of the permit requirement. The brochure with a map delineating the three camping zones on Hosmer Lake would also help to inform visitors. Most people would not respond favorably to this new system, preferring instead no permit to disperse camp.

Visitors would maintain their "sense of discovery" since campsite locations would not be identified on the map; only camping zones would be identified along with the number of camps allowed in each.

Informational Signing

Brochures describing the ecology of Hosmer Lake will help deter uninformed visitors from adversely impacting the natural resources of the area. Brochures would be made available at Forest Service offices, by Forest Service personnel and from the campground host. Themes for the brochures will focus on conservation education, wildlife habitat and forest visitor etiquette. There is slight potential that these actions could increase use on the lake by those that weren't aware of the dispersed camping and wildlife viewing opportunities. This is likely a small percentage of visitors since information about Hosmer Lake attributes are readily available in many publications, the Internet and maps.

Campfires in Dispersed Sites

This alternative would allow campfires in dispersed campsites in accordance with other National Forest requirements. During the camping season, campers would be able to have campfires in fire rings at their sites. Many campers expect to have an evening or morning campfire for cooking or aesthetic reasons. This alternative would provide the option to have a warming or cooking fire throughout the camping season. Campfires would be restricted when Public Use Restrictions are in place. However, the chance of a wildfire to occur from an unattended or escaped campfire would be greatest under this alternative of all alternatives.

Islands

The closure of all islands to day and overnight use would impact visitors who frequent them for wildlife viewing, lunch stops or as a rest area. This could result in competition for the dispersed campsites as day users may frequent them for picnics and rest areas. If dispersed campsites are full, there is the potential for new day use areas to be developed on non-impacted shoreline areas.

Impacts to island habitat from campfires would be mitigated under this alternative. This could increase the use of the islands by eagles, waterfowl and other wildlife. Information about the island closures would be included in the brochures, from Forest Service personnel and the campground host. No signs would be posted on the islands, which could result in some confusion by those visitors that do not see the signs at the parking areas, or do not read it in the brochure before visiting the islands.

Alternative 3

Alternative 3 proposes a different approach to the placement of the parking area and the designation and registration of dispersed overnight campsites.

Facility Function: Parking and Accessible Toilet

Boat Ramp Parking Area

The existing parking area and parking restrictions on Road 4625 and the boat ramp access road would be the same as in Alternative 2. The addition of the "no boat trailer parking" and "head in parking only" at this facility would reduce congestion and overflow conditions at this site even further. This could result in frustration and anger by boat users who are accustomed to parking their trailers at this lower parking area. The likelihood of boaters parking their vehicles in vacant campsite spurs is the same as in Alternative 2.

Upper Parking Area

This alternative allows for vehicles with boat trailers at this upper facility. Vegetation screens left where possible between the parking lot and the toilet would reduce the any adverse impact from the campground and Road 4625. Many comments collected from visitors indicate that an upper parking area is needed to accommodate use and reduce congestion at the boat ramp parking area. Some visitors will not agree with the requirement to park boat trailers only at this upper lot. There would be no effect to T, E and S plant or animal species with the construction of this facility.

Toilet Facilities

This proposal and effects would be the same as Alternative 2, with an accessible trail being constructed to the upper parking area.

Recreation Experience, Wetland & Wildlife Habitat: Dispersed Camping

Dispersed Camping

This alternative would have the greatest effect on the availability of dispersed campsites for overnight

camping (reduction from 13 to 6 campsites). Competition for the remaining campsites would increase, as well as the occupancy rate for the season.

Since they would be more difficult to be readily seen, the inconspicuous "No Camping - Area Closed" signs may not be effective in keeping campers out of restoration areas. This in effect could increase the time needed for restoration efforts to be fulfilled as visitors may still access and use these areas until they see the sign informing them of the closure.

Camping Permit

Because there is no dispersed camping permit required, this alternative would have the same effect as the No Action Alternative. Overnight camping would be permitted unless posted otherwise. No camping permit or registration would be required. However, without maps or other information to inform visitors about the numbers of campsites and where they are allowed, or because of the small inconspicuous signs discussed above, it's possible that new campsites could be developed in previously un-impacted areas.

Informational Signing

Lack of informational signing and/or brochures about Hosmer resources and conservation education themes may hinder restoration efforts. Without informative and educational materials to share with the public, uninformed visitors may be unintentionally adversely affecting vegetative and wildlife resources in the area. (See "Camping Permit" above.)

Campfires

The result of permanently banning campfires in dispersed campsites would reduce or eliminate the threat of a human caused wildfire originating from these sites. It could also reduce the satisfaction level of some dispersed campers who expect or prefer a campfire for utilitarian or aesthetic reasons.

Islands

Alternative 3 would be the same as Alternative 2 with additional sign posting and monitoring to determine whether the closures divert recreational use to other sensitive riparian areas. Signs posted on the islands would help reduce any confusion by visitors who did not read the signs or the brochure informing them of the closure. However, posting effective signs on these small islands would detract from the aesthetics and setting of the area.

Alternative 4

Alternative 4 includes all of the elements of the proposed parking layout and design of Alternative 3, and combines elements of the dispersed site management proposal of both Alternatives 2 and 3. This alternative would close the northernmost island to public use for 5 years and apply a seasonal restriction

to the other islands.

Facility Function: Parking and Accessible Toilet

Effects would all be the same as Alternative 3.

Recreation Experience, Wetland & Wildlife Habitat: Dispersed Camping

Dispersed Camping

Alternative 4 would have similar effects as in Alternative 3 in regards to being less intrusive on dispersed campers (no permit required). It would have a similar effect as in Alternative 2 with "designated zones" and a total of 8 campsites available.

Posted information and brochures with maps would increase visitor awareness and knowledge of the zones and allowed number of camps.

Dispersed Camping Permit

There would be no permit or registration required for campsites as described above. Effects would be the same as Alternative 3.

Informational Signing

Alternative 4 would be the most effective in sharing information with the public in regards to ecology and conservation education messages. As with Alternative 2, informational brochures would be provided. Additionally, Alternative 4 would emphasize visitor etiquette, camping zones and conservation and wildlife themes with signing at both parking areas.

Campfires in Dispersed Sites

Alternative 4 would have the same effect as Alternative 3.

Islands

Alternative 4 provides the least effect to lake visitors of all the action alternatives. The 2 southernmost islands only seasonally restricted to reduce disturbance to eagles raising their young (1/1 through 8/31 if the nest is occupied), this alternative would allow use of these islands for the Labor Day Holiday and end of the season. The northernmost island would be closed for 5 years to monitor the effectiveness on eaglet survival rates. Though much of the season is still restricted, it still allows use of 2 of the islands for at least the last portion of the camping season, or all season if the nest is not occupied (this is usually

determined by mid-June).

Public Health and Safety

Proposed activities in Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 would improve public health and safety by reducing congestion and overcrowded conditions at the existing boat ramp parking area and access road. Installation of a parking area at road 4625 and 4625-600 and improvements at the boat ramp would alleviate a hazardous condition (pedestrian safety) by separating parking areas and limiting where vehicles are allowed to park along the access road. All other proposed activities would not expose the public to an increased risk of injury above hazards associated with routine forest practices.

Heritage Resources

An appropriate inventory has been conducted for this undertaking and properties eligible for the National Register for Historic Places (NHRP). All evaluated and unevaluated sites would be avoided; therefore, the undertaking meets the criteria given in Stipulation III.B.1 of the Programmatic Agreement among the USDA Forest Service, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Oregon State Historic Preservation Officer. There would be no known direct, indirect, or cumulative effects to these resources.

Prime Lands

There are no lands within the project area that are classified as prime farm or rangelands. Proposed activities in Alternatives 2 and 3 would not change areas classified as prime forestland. There would be no direct, indirect, or cumulative adverse effect to these resources and thus are in compliance with the Farmland Protection Act and Departmental Regulation 9500-3, 'Land Use Policy'.

Executive Orders 11988 (Floodplain Management) and 11990 (Protection of Wetlands)

Executive Orders 11988 and 11990 direct Federal agencies to avoid, to the extent possible, both short-term and long-term adverse impacts associated with the modifications of floodplains and wetlands. All alternatives have no specific actions that adversely affect wetlands and floodplains. Proposed activities in Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 are compliant with the orders and USDA Departmental Regulation 9500-3.

Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 provide benefits to the riparian vegetation through the restoration of the north end of the existing parking area. As described in the alternatives, the rock and cinder surface will be removed, and the area will be re-vegetated with native plants.

Environmental Justice

The Alternatives 2, 3 or 4 would not pose adverse effects to minority communities or residents of low or moderate income. Known dispersed camping opportunities surrounding the lake would be reduced by 39% in Alternatives 2 and 4, while Alternative 3 is reduced by 54%. Some displacement of dispersed campers would occur on peak weekends and holidays under all alternatives, with the most displacement occurring in Alternative 3. Proposed activities are in compliance with Executive Order 12989 "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations".

Social Factors

There would be no known direct, indirect, or cumulative adverse effects on Native Americans, women, or the civil rights of citizens as a result of implementation of any alternative.

Compliance With State and Local Laws

Implementation of Alternative 2, 3 or 4 would be consistent with State and local laws, land use, and environmental policies.

Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 follow State of Oregon requirements in accordance with the Clean Water Act for protection of waters. Application of Best Management Practices (BMPs) are selected and designed on site-specific conditions for waters potentially impacted in the Hosmer area. While not specifically mentioned as "BMPs" in the environmental analysis; the interdisciplinary team has reviewed and incorporated applicable BMP water quality objectives in the design of Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 and their mitigation measures. Standards and Guidelines for the Northwest Forest Plan (Riparian Reserves) were developed (in part) to maintain and restore aquatic ecosystems for riparian dependent species. These standards and guidelines afford the same or greater protection of stream courses as direction found in the 1988 USDA publication "General Water Quality - Best Management Practices". Protection of water quality is also provided by incorporation of BMPs in Oregon Department of Environmental Quality oversight on recreational facility design.

GOTO

- [Chapter I](#)
- [Chapter II](#)
- [Chapter III](#)
- [Chapter IV](#)
- [Chapter V](#)
- Chapter VI

- [Chapter VII](#)
- [Chapter VIII](#)
- [Appendix A](#)
- [Appendix B](#)
- [Appendix C](#)
- [Appendix D](#)
- [Appendix E](#)
- [Appendix F](#)
- [Appendix G](#)
- [Appendix H](#)
- [Appendix I](#)

[Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests Website](#)

<http://www.fs.fed.us/centraloregon/manageinfo/nepa/documents/bendfort/hosmer/chapter6.html>

Last Update: 6/8/01

R.A. Jensen

HOSMER LAKE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVISION TO THE CASCADE LAKES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

VII. Discussion of Reasonable Foreseeable Future Actions Within and Adjacent to the Project Area

Sheep Bridge Campground EA

Proposes to designate approximately 22 campsites and parking for day users and boaters. Travel surfaces would be designed to reduce dust. Vegetation would be planted to restore loss of vegetation and to provide screening between campsites.

West Twin Lake EA

Proposes to construct an amphitheater, fish cleaning station, expand parking and replace a restroom.

Twin Lakes Resort Drain Field Project Categorical Exclusion

Authorizes the addition of approximately 1,000 feet of drain field, septic tank, and grease trap at Twin Lakes Resort to upgrade the overall septic system for the facility.

Cascade Lakes Overlay Project EA

The Federal Highway Administration is currently proposing an overlay of asphalt approximately 30 miles of Cascade Lakes Highway from Elk Lake to Davis Lake. The project is proposed for summer of 2001 and would include some culvert replacement and/or extension. No additional disturbance of cut/fill slopes is anticipated.

Cascade Lakes Scenic Byways

A project is proposed which would construct three sites to provide visitor orientation and interpretation on the Cascade Lakes Scenic Byway: the North Portal Entry located five miles west of Bend, the South Portal Entry located two miles east of the junction with county road 61, and the Elk Lake Guard Station. In addition, parking areas and entry roads would be paved, interpretive signs added, and a toilet relocated to enhance the Blue Lagoon Trailhead and Osprey Point/Quinn River interpretive site.

East Browns Quarry Restoration Project

Restoration activities have been authorized for East Browns Quarry, including creation of wet meadow habitat, 1.5 acres of seasonal pond habitat, and an interpretive parking and trail area.

Wickiup Reservoir Fish Habitat Restoration CE

Proposes to selectively place 200 trees weighted with boulders into Wickiup Reservoir near Sheep Bridge Campground. The objective is to improve: 1) hiding cover for both rearing and migrating fish, and 2) increase invertebrate (insects) production to provide forage.

Riparian Planting Project

Activities include restoration of a vehicle pullout and user-made trail by placing boulders and planting riparian vegetation at Browns Creek where road 4280 crosses.

Wickiup Dam Modification

Modifications to Wickiup Dam are proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation to correct safety deficiencies. The modifications are designed to add stability to foundation and embankment materials during seismic events, and include construction of a filter blanket and stability berm along the downstream toe of the dam. An identified site to be considered for source materials is located within the reservoir near the dam.

GOTO

- [Chapter I](#)
- [Chapter II](#)
- [Chapter III](#)
- [Chapter IV](#)
- [Chapter V](#)
- [Chapter VI](#)
- Chapter VII
- [Chapter VIII](#)
- [Appendix A](#)
- [Appendix B](#)

- [Appendix C](#)
- [Appendix D](#)
- [Appendix E](#)
- [Appendix F](#)
- [Appendix G](#)
- [Appendix H](#)
- [Appendix I](#)

[Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests Website](#)

<http://www.fs.fed.us/centraloregon/manageinfo/nepa/documents/bendfort/hosmer/chapter7.html>

Last Update: 6/8/01

R.A. Jensen

HOSMER LAKE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVISION TO THE CASCADE LAKES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

VIII. List of Preparers and Consultation With Others

This section identifies the Forest Service and other agency personnel who participated in the analysis and the preparation of the EA. For a list of organizations and individuals contacted during the scoping process, refer to the project file located at the Bend-Ft. Rock Ranger District.

Interdisciplinary Team

Steve Bigby - District Road Manager
Mollie Chaudet - Team Leader/Writer
Charmane Levack - Botanist
James Lowrie - Biologist
Tom Walker - Fisheries
Robin Lee - Landscape Architect
Les Moscoso - IDT Leader/Writer/Recreation Planner
Gini Stoddard - Geographical Information Systems

GOTO

- [Chapter I](#)
- [Chapter II](#)
- [Chapter III](#)
- [Chapter IV](#)
- [Chapter V](#)
- [Chapter VI](#)
- [Chapter VII](#)
- Chapter VIII
- [Appendix A](#)

- [Appendix B](#)
- [Appendix C](#)
- [Appendix D](#)
- [Appendix E](#)
- [Appendix F](#)
- [Appendix G](#)
- [Appendix H](#)
- [Appendix I](#)

[Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests Website](#)

<http://www.fs.fed.us/centraloregon/manageinfo/nepa/documents/bendfort/hosmer/chapter8.html>

Last Update: 6/8/01

R.A. Jensen

HOSMER LAKE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVISION TO THE CASCADE LAKES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX A

APPLICABLE STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF THE HOSMER LAKE AREA

Northwest Forest Plan (NWFP)

Riparian Reserves are a critical component of the Northwest Forest Plan for preservation of old growth and riparian dependant species. The geographic extent of Riparian Reserves around lakes such as Hosmer are defined as the water body itself and the area to the outer edges of the riparian vegetation or seasonally saturated soil or 300 feet slope distance, whichever is greatest.

The Aquatic Conservation Strategy and applicable standards and guidelines guide management of Riparian Reserves. The Aquatic Conservation Strategy addresses environments such as Hosmer Lake and sets forth objectives (NWFP, pg B-11) to:

- "restore the physical integrity of the aquatic system, including shorelines, banks and bottom configurations."
- "restore and maintain the species composition and structural diversity of plant communities in riparian areas and wetlands."
- "maintenance and protection of habitat to support well-distributed populations of native plant, invertebrate and vertebrate" species.
- wetlands need to provide "sufficient habitat such that wildlife species can survive, grow, reproduce and migrate unimpeded."
- water quality, must be maintained or restored if needed.

The Northwest Forest Plan recognizes that there are existing recreational developments such as campgrounds within Riparian Reserves and sets forth standards and guidelines for management of these facilities in this context.

Recreation Management (RM-1) "New recreational facilities within Riparian Reserves, including trails and dispersed sites, should be designed to not prevent meeting the Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives. Construction of facilities should not prevent future attainment of these objectives. For existing recreation facilities within Riparian Reserves, evaluate and mitigate impact to ensure that these do not prevent, and to the extent practicable contribute to, attainment of Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives." (NWFP, pg C-34).

Recreation Management (RM-2) "Adjust dispersed and developed recreation practices that retard or prevent attainment of Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives. Where adjustment measures such as education, use limitations, traffic control devices, increased maintenance, relocation of facilities, and/or specific site closures are not effective, eliminate the practice or occupancy." (NWFP, pg C-34)

Watershed and habitat restoration is encouraged in the Northwest Forest Plan where watershed analysis shows a demonstrated need. Standards and guidelines for watershed restoration applicable to Hosmer Lake include: (WR-1) "Design and implement watershed restoration projects that promote the long term ecological integrity of ecosystems and.... attain Aquatic conservation Strategy Objectives, "and (WR-3) "Do not use mitigation or planned restoration as a substitute for preventing habitat degradation." (NWFP, pg C-37)

Under the category of General Riparian Area Management (RA-2) it is policy to "fell trees in Riparian Reserves when they pose a safety risk. Keep felled trees on-site when needed to meet coarse woody debris objectives." (NWFP, pg C-37).

Fish and wildlife management in the Northwest Forest Plan directs the Forest Service to (FW-1) "Design and implement fish and wildlife habitat restoration and enhancement activities in a manner that contributes to attainment of the Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives." (NWFP, pg C-37).

Fire/Fuels management in Riparian Reserves is designed to minimize the size of all fires. Management activities however should be designed to meet the objectives of the Aquatic Conservation Strategy (NWFP, FM-1, pg C-35).

Deschutes National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP)

The Hosmer Lake area has four management area allocations under the Deschutes NF LRMP: Intensive Recreation (about 50% of the shoreline), Bald Eagle Management Area (about 30% of the shoreline), Scenic Views (about 15% of the shoreline), and the proposed Hosmer Lake Special Interest Area (about 5% of the shoreline).

Intensive Recreation

Within Management Area 11 (Intensive Recreation) the primary reason for facility improvement or changes is to meet the projected increase in the number of Forest visitors. The type of day-use facilities

will change over time to reflect the changing recreation need of the public. In campgrounds there will be a continued emphasis on rehabilitation and heavy maintenance of existing sites (M11-3 and M11-4).

Wildlife management emphasis will be on habitat improvement for watchable wildlife and maintaining or improving fish habitat. Snags determined to be safety hazards should be topped or removed, but where possible snags and green trees needed for future snags should be maintained at 60 percent of maximum potential population of cavity nesting species (M11-31).

Fuel load management related to removal of hazard trees will be treated quickly and to a level commensurate with the increased risk and protection of recreation values. In general, areas within sight distance of campgrounds and other high use areas should have almost 100 percent clean up of activity fuels (fuels associated with vegetation management, M11-44). Maintenance of fuels for appearance and for firewood (and also as indicated for wildlife values above) is acceptable.

Bald Eagle Management Area

The goal of Bald Eagle Management Areas is to enhance the carrying capacity of the habitat for the eagles. Nesting and foraging habitat will be protected and enhanced. Human disturbance will be minimal during the nesting season.

"Areas will be managed to provide dispersed recreation opportunities such as hiking, bird watching, and hunting that are compatible with maintaining desired populations of these wildlife species"(M3-1).

Special Interest Area

The goal of the Special Interest Areas is to preserve and provide interpretation of unique geological, biological and cultural characteristics for education, scientific, and public enjoyment. Management actions are allowed when they do not interfere with the intent of this goal (M1-1 through M1-20).

Scenic Views

The goal of the Scenic Views management area is to provide forest visitors with high quality scenery that represents the natural character of Central Oregon.

"New recreational developments and changes to existing developments are permitted as long as they are consistent with desired visual condition." (M9-1)

"Parking facilities, structures and other recreational facilities will normally be placed where they are not

visible from significant viewer locations. Where it is not possible to screen recreational facilities, they will be designed to blend with the elements found in the natural landscape and will remain subordinate to the overall visual strength of the surrounding landscape." (M9-2)

GOTO

- [Chapter I](#)
- [Chapter II](#)
- [Chapter III](#)
- [Chapter IV](#)
- [Chapter V](#)
- [Chapter VI](#)
- [Chapter VII](#)
- [Chapter VIII](#)
- Appendix A
- [Appendix B](#)
- [Appendix C](#)
- [Appendix D](#)
- [Appendix E](#)
- [Appendix F](#)
- [Appendix G](#)
- [Appendix H](#)
- [Appendix I](#)

[Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests Website](#)

<http://www.fs.fed.us/centraloregon/manageinfo/nepa/documents/bendfort/hosmer/appendixa.html>

Last Update: 6/8/01

R.A. Jensen

HOSMER LAKE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVISION TO THE CASCADE LAKES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX B

HOSMER LAKE CAMPGROUNDS HAZARD TREE TREATMENT AND PUBLIC REVIEW PROCESS

Hazard Tree Designation

The Forest Service has a responsibility to manage hazard trees within the Hosmer Lake Campgrounds and surrounding environs in a way that will effectively provide for public safety, efficiently manage the campground, and provide for reasonable public use during the normal operating season. Protection and preservation of the natural and aesthetic character of the campgrounds and the Riparian Reserves within which they lie are primary considerations when identifying how those hazards are managed. These considerations should embody the long-term goals of the Hosmer Lake Campgrounds to maintain and enhance the recreation experience Hosmer Lake visitors have come to know and enjoy, prevent damage to wetland and wildlife habitats, and restore wetland habitats damaged by use or other actions.

Hazard Tree management in the Hosmer Lake Campgrounds and surrounding environs will be based on a conservative, "go slow" (remove less more frequently) approach. The goal of hazard tree management should be to annually or semi-annually designate the fewest trees necessary to meet campground safety requirements. Generally, this means removal or topping only those trees rated as "Very High" or "High" hazards according to the Region 6 Hazard Tree Handbook Rating System. Green trees are normally not in these categories but may be included if there is sufficient defect to warrant immediate treatment. When, following treatment of the hazard, it has been determined that removal of the resulting down wood from the area must be done, the goal will be to designate a method that will result in the least amount of impact to the ground considering the environmental and economic costs of the removal methods. (See also "Hazard Tree Treatment")

A wildlife biologist, experienced hazard tree evaluator, recreation, and experienced tree removal specialist will be a member of any team designating and evaluating treatments for hazard trees.

To the extent possible while ensuring a reasonable level of public safety, dead, dying, or defective trees that do not directly affect developed campsites, facilities, or desired travel ways, should be left standing to fall naturally. Special consideration of natural ecological interactions should be included in the selection of treatment methods for hazard trees in otherwise undisturbed areas with riparian and/or wetland characteristics such as those identified on the attached map. (Attachment A)

Hazard Tree Treatment

When a hazard tree is designated the following considerations, in order of priority, will be made concerning treatment:

1. Can the tree be safely topped without undue risk or unreasonable cost and left standing subject to annual review?
2. If the tree must be felled, can it be left on site or nearby to achieve goals of reducing campground sprawl, increasing campground privacy, or improving down wood components in riparian areas without creating unsafe fuel loading in or adjacent to campgrounds? Will leaving a "high" stump help achieve these objectives or enhance the recreational use of the site?
3. If the down wood must be removed from the site, what method of removal would cause the least impact to that site? Methods of removal of down wood should consider the impacts to the vegetation, soils, and other flora as well as the economics of getting the material removed.
 - a. Emphasis should be placed first on making the wood available for public use within the campgrounds, to meet fisheries or recreation facility needs, or for other public benefits. Volunteer or charity organizations should be given opportunities to remove the wood in accordance with existing rules and regulations governing the use of personal or commercial firewood use.
 - b. "Mechanical" removal (the use of large machinery such as skidders or excavators), while not prohibited, should generally only be used where, because of the nature, volume, or placement of the material, it will clearly have less impact to the campground resources than other methods. Mechanical methods might also be employed if other methods of removal of down wood are not available, cannot be completed in a timely manner thus preventing reasonable operation of the campground, or are clearly the only affordable method of achieving objectives. Mechanical methods would almost certainly be required if whole trees (including root wads) were made available for fishery enhancement projects.
 - c. Use of a "commercial" contractor, removal by "sale", or other methods that will meet overall objectives should be considered. Economic considerations will not drive removal of standing or down material at the expense of resource considerations, or in violation of

any of the goals for the management of hazard trees.

Down Wood and Fuel Loads

To preserve the natural and aesthetic environment of the Hosmer Lake Campgrounds and associated areas, large down wood resulting from hazard tree felling or natural causes that does not create unsafe fuel loadings or other physical hazards should be utilized to reduce campground sprawl, prevent soil compaction, increase campground privacy, reduce human use in sensitive areas, or improve down wood components in the Riparian Reserve (A 300' area surrounding Hosmer Lake recommended in the Cascade Lakes Watershed Analysis in accordance with the Northwest Forest Plan). The public will be encouraged to use small diameter wood such as limb material, or cut wood supplied specifically for campfires, but chainsaw use by campground users to cut up large down wood will be prohibited.

Large wood left to accomplish these objectives will normally not exceed an average of 8-10 tons per acre in any given area. To the extent possible, large wood will be left or moved to positions that put it fully in touch with the ground to minimize the amount of seasonal drying of the wood. Large "jackstraw" piles of wood will normally not be left in areas adjacent to campfire rings or where they might create other unsafe conditions for campground users or fire suppression activities. These guidelines are intended to provide general rules for the personnel involved in determining the amount and arrangement of large down wood to be left within the campground environment, and not as an inclusive list of all possible conditions to be considered.

Areas adjacent to the campgrounds outside of the Riparian Reserves, and including the area between South Campground and road 4625, should be evaluated for fuel loadings based on the goals of maintaining natural and aesthetic characteristics as viewed from the campgrounds (including "watchable wildlife" habitat represented by large diameter snags or down wood), to provide defensible space to firefighters in conjunction with the overall suppression strategies for the Cascade Lakes area, and to reduce concentrations of high hazard fuels. This evaluation should consider the use of fuel model photo series including fuel model 3-LP-3 as displayed in Forest Service publication PNW 105 (May 1980) to determine whether it would meet these goals. Treatments for these areas should also emphasize low impact methods such as hand piling of small diameter material.

Monitoring and Timing of Treatments

Treatment monitoring will be the responsibility of the Bend/Ft. Rock District Recreation and Community Relations Team Leader and will emphasize on-site Forest Service presence during treatment activities. Treatments will be evaluated annually to determine consistency with overall campground management goals.

Treatments will generally occur in the fall, after the closing of the campground and before the snow eliminates access. Depending upon the efficiency of the fall treatment methods and level of winter damage, some treatments may also be needed in the spring.

Public Review

The goal of the public review process of hazard tree management at the Hosmer Lake Campgrounds is to increase the District's accountability for and the public's involvement in decisions about which trees in the campgrounds are designated hazards and how those hazards are reduced or eliminated.

To achieve that goal, the District will identify hazard trees and the proposed treatments annually and make that information available upon request to the public. For as long as public interest continues, the Deschutes Provincial Advisory Committee's Hosmer Lake Monitoring Subcommittee and interested members of the public will be offered an annual opportunity for an on-site review of all hazard tree designations and proposed treatments. This should generally include public notice no less than 15 days prior to the review. This time frame should allow interested parties sufficient time to prepare for the site visit, file written comments on the ratings and rationale for selection of hazard trees, or raise other issues concerning the proposed treatments. The review will generally occur in the fall, between September 15 and October 15. This coincides with when the bulk of campground hazard tree treatments are generally scheduled.

Incidental spring hazard tree treatments following winter damage may also be needed when there is insufficient time to allow a full public review prior to scheduled campground openings. When such conditions apply, where practicable, the Deschutes Provincial Advisory Committee's Hosmer Lake Subcommittee and interested members of the public will be given a short, advanced notice. Otherwise, notice will be given as soon as possible after treatment occurs and treatment descriptions will be included in the following fall review.

GOTO

- [Chapter I](#)
- [Chapter II](#)
- [Chapter III](#)
- [Chapter IV](#)
- [Chapter V](#)
- [Chapter VI](#)
- [Chapter VII](#)
- [Chapter VIII](#)
- [Appendix A](#)
- Appendix B

- [Appendix C](#)
- [Appendix D](#)
- [Appendix E](#)
- [Appendix F](#)
- [Appendix G](#)
- [Appendix H](#)
- [Appendix I](#)

[Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests Website](#)

<http://www.fs.fed.us/centraloregon/manageinfo/nepa/documents/bendfort/hosmer/appendixb.html>

Last Update: 6/8/01

R.A. Jensen

HOSMER LAKE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVISION TO THE CASCADE LAKES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX C

PUBLIC COMMENTS COLLECTED AND HOW ADDRESSED

The following addresses how written comments to the Hosmer project will be addressed in the EA (the "link" between the original comment letters and other comments collected in the field). This document tiers to the 11/1/99 "Response to Issues" paper (which was derived from the 8/17/98 "Preliminary Issues"), the letter file and Field Ranger data. As such, they should be used in conjunction with the following tables. Comment letters were numbered as a reference point when addressing issues. Each issue was lettered (A, B, C, etc.) and then identified how addressed via the "Response to Issues" document and the table below. Table 1 displays data collected from letters and voluntary comment forms collected by the Campground host.

Table 7: Comments to Proposed Action and How Addressed.

Category	Letter #	Issue	How Addressed
<i>Dispersed Camping</i>	2	C: Can't enforce designated sites proposal.	Common to all.
	4	D: Brochures will increase use.	Effects.
	5	A: Disagrees w/reduction of disp. sites to 8.	EC/DFC*.
	6	Misunderstanding that dispersed site reduction is for dev. CGs.	N/A
	7	A: Opposes any reduction in campsites since use is increasing.	Effects/DFC/Alts.
	8	C: Zone concept is impractical; popularize w/signs.	Effects/Alts.
	12	E: Zone concept is impractical; popularize w/signs.	Effects/Alts.
	13	A: Signs/brochures could increase use.	Effects/Alts.

	15	A: Strongly disagree to only 3 areas. Reduces sense of discovery. No evidence of shoreline damage. Registering w/camp host is unwelcome measure of control.	EC/DFC/Alt.
	16	B: Disp. permit would increase liability.	Alts.
	17	SAME AS 15	EC/DFC/Alt.
	20	A: Doesn't agree w/sites south of outlet. No permits; would only increase use, liability.	Alts.
	21	A: Ban camping that is visible from the lake.	Considered but eliminated.
	22	B: Ban campfires.	Alts.
	24	A: Organize so campers know when sites are taken.	Effects/Alts.
	25	B: Too much waste left behind.	Irrelevant
	27	B: Sites should be off the channel and away from the shore.	Considered but eliminated.
	35	A: Registered campers should be held accountable for fires, etc.	Irrelevant
	42	A: Support closures.	N/A
<i>Boat Ramp & Parking</i>	2	A: Loss of 2 campsites unacceptable. Nothing should be done w/the existing lot.	EC/Effects/Alts.
	4	C: Parking area needs management.	Effects/Alts.
	7	E: Crowding could be reduced w/another lot.	Effects/Alt. 3 & 4
	8	D: Deletion of 2 campsites is against project goal (maintain & improve rec. exp.).	Alts.
	9	C: Loss of 2 sites bad for popular CG. D: Need designated parking for trailers.	Alts. Alts.
	10	B: Not enough parking for current use.	Alts.
	12	A: More campsites are needed, not less (w/ reduction for parking).	Alts.
	13	D: Not enough space for trailers.	Alts.
	20	B: Proposed parking area will increase noise/use of CG; area is on a steep slope.	Alts.
	21	C: Don't build capacity to hold more than what currently exists.	Alts.
<i>Islands</i>	2	E: Enforcing island closure not practical.	Alts. 2-4

	12	F: Island closures seem unnecessary since no evidence of waterfowl use shown by FS.	EC/DFC/Effects
	13	C: Supports Closure.	N/A
Liabilities	2	F: Remove camp fees & post signs about hazards.	Considered but eliminated.
	7	C: " "	"
	8	B: " "	"
	12	C: " "	"
	16	A: " "	"
	18	A: " "	"
	20	K: Managing for a liability is inappropriate.	Outside scope
Hazard Trees	1	A: Once you take trees, the ones left will be hazardous due to blow down.	Effects.
	2	G: Designating hazards seem arbitrary even w/guides.	Outside scope.
	3	A: Supports removal of fuel loads.	Irrelevant.
	7	D: Cutting 100-200 trees/year seems excessive.	Common to All.
	8	A: Removal is in conflict of goals. Seriously reduce WL/bird habitat.	Effects
	9	A: Removal is in conflict of goals.	Effects
	12	G: Removal is having significant impact on human ecology. Should do EIS.	Outside scope
	13	B: Support limited removal where public safety is a factor.	Common to All.
	16	A: If want to keep WL habitat, then should let snags stand.	"
	18	B: Removal is in conflict of goals.	"
	20	N: Removal is in conflict of goals.	"
	21	D: Leave as many trees as possible for screening.	"
	22	A: Be careful how many are cut.	"
	23	A: Should we be interfering w/natural changes?	EC & Common to All.
	25	C: Questions need for intervention. Dead trees also support WL.	"
	31	A: Okay. Leave some for campfires.	Common to All.
	33	A: Thinning okay.	Irrelevant

Day Use	19	A: Dissatisfaction w/day use crowding in channel. Canoeists need a place to park/ place canoes in the water.	Common to All.
Dust	4	B: Need to reduce dust in CGs.	Common to All.
Fees	29	A: Charge more to reduce use.	Outside scope.
Concessionaire	1	B: Not providing any service, only collecting fees.	Irrelevant.
	9	E: Environmental insensitivity.	Outside scope.
	12	D: Environmental insensitivity.	Outside scope.
	20	H: Concession operations have had a negative impact on habitat.	Outside scope.
Dispersed Campfires	20	A: Limit campfires to season prior to 7/1 to allow burning of some of the accumulated fuel.	Alts.
	21	B: Ban campfires.	Alts.
Rules	24	A: Supports more restrictive use.	Alts.
	30	A: Mixed feelings. Likes to make it more restrictive, but not sure what would happen to folks who come from far away to find the camp full?	Alts.
	31	A: Limit regulations to only those necessary.	Alts.
	32	A: Too many restrictions.	Irrelevant.
	33	A: More regulation necessary.	Alts.
	36	A: Favors some control to maintain area.	Alts.
Fire Hazard	20	G: Fire danger overstated. Slash is most dangerous ground fuel not large logs.	Common to All.
Use Limits	10	C: No need to limit access (not enough campsites, parking areas).	Alts.
	34	A: Would hate to be turned away.	Irrelevant.
	37	A: Better for area; plenty of other places for people to go.	Irrelevant.
	39	B: Idea of limiting use okay.	Irrelevant.
Setting & Experience	4	B: Surface roads; harden campsites to accommodate user needs (vehicles).	Outside scope.
	14	A: Various suggestions to limit RV camping: only in sites opposite the lake (views), lg. RVs only in designated sites, prohibit generators, limit size of RV.	Outside scope.

21	D: Keep visual experience positive.	Irrelevant.
28	A: Doesn't address group/day use.	Outside scope.
33	C: Fewer people means better experience.	Irrelevant.
37	B: Preserve tranquility.	Irrelevant.
40	B: Don't improve campground.	Irrelevant; outside scope.
42	B: Separate motorized from non-motorized camping (generators).	Outside scope.

The following table displays comments and data collected by Field Rangers at Hosmer Lake. Comments were collected on a voluntary "Comment Form" at the boat ramp, in the developed campgrounds and on the lake itself. Both overnight and day use visitor comments were gathered. Most of the comments collected from the Field Rangers are similar in nature or the same as those from the letter file. Some are general comments that are not directly related to the Proposed Action.

Table 8: Selected Results of Public Comments Gathered By Field Rangers at Hosmer Lake in 1998 and 1999.

SELECTED QUESTIONS	1998	1999
How many times a summer do you visit?	First visit - 5 2 to 5 - 20 6 to 10 - 1 11+ - 2	First visit - 6 2 to 5 - 16 6 to 10 - 6 11+ - 0
Use levels on the lake are:	Very low - 0 Low - 2 Okay - 12 High - 20 Very High - 7	Very low - 0 Low - 4 Okay - 20 High - 5 Very High - 4
Value of solitude is important to me (rank 1-5, 5 being highest).	1 - 0 2 - 1 (39%) 3 - 3 (8%) 4 - 13 (33%) 5 - 23 (58%)	1 - 2 (6%) 2 - 3 (9%) 3 - 4 (12%) 4 - 10 (30%) 5 - 14 (42%)
When do you visit, week or weekend?	Week - 18 (35%) Weekend - 33 (65%)	Week - 32 (89%) Weekend - 4 (12%)
Why? (Work, not as crowded, or other).	Work - 14 (27%) Not as crowded - 37 (73%) Other - 0	Work - 13 (36%) Not as crowded - 17 (47%) Other - First visit (3%) Retired (3%)

Comments:

- Don't commercialize or charge fees! **Considered but eliminated.**
- Dead wood should be taken out at Hosmer and Cultus, perhaps for a wood sale. **Common to all.**
- More developed campsites needed. Increase # of campsites to keep up with use. **Outside scope.**
- Concerned about fire hazard from dead trees left in the campground. **EC/Effects.**
- In favor of utilizing "natural pesticides" or fungicides to discourage beetle. **Outside scope.**
- Do not increase facilities! **Outside scope/irrelevant.**
- Don't encourage more use by adding "improvements". **Alts.**
- Don't pave or improve...leave as is. **No action.**
- Put signs at boat ramp to explain/educate visitors on ecology/sensitivity of area. **PA.**
- Need to thin/cut down "problem" trees. **Common to All.**
- Wants to see upper parking area. **Irrelevant.**
- Don't impose any restrictions/use permits on the lake. **No action.**
- Eliminate hunting, generators; preserve wildlife. **Outside scope.**
- Opposed to closing islands to camping. **Effects; No Action.**
- Dead wood should be removed. **Down wood.**
- Provide more access to lake from campsites. **Outside scope.**
- Provide water, firewood. **Outside scope.**
- Don't like concession operators. **Outside scope.**
- Provide reservations. **Outside scope.**
- Add toilet at north end of Mallard Marsh CG. **Outside scope.**
- Likes quiet of the lake. **Irrelevant.**
- Wants FS to be "proactive" in management. **Irrelevant.**
- Concerned about user conflicts between canoers & anglers in channel. **Day use.**
- Likes permit system proposal for dispersed camping. **Irrelevant.**
- Indirect mgt. of use okay, direct through use limits or permits not good. **Opinion.**
- Upgrade roads. **Irrelevant.**
- FS should take back the operations of the campground. **Outside scope.**
- Agree w/limiting/designating disp. camping. **Outside scope.**
- Likes chainsaw restriction. **Outside scope.**
- Eliminate motorized use. **Outside scope.**
- Need to review outfitter/guide use. **Outside scope.**
- With less camping available, where will people go? **Alts.; Effects.**
- Should restrict dispersed camping because of fire hazard. **Considered but eliminated.**
- Should limit # people/campsite. **Outside scope, common to all.**
- Concerned about bears. **Irrelevant.**
- Reducing use is a good idea. **Irrelevant.**
- Important to maintain beauty & WL. **Irrelevant.**

The following tallies the type and percentages for all comments collected from the data in Tables 8 and 9 (scoping letter responses and Field Ranger comment forms). The totals shown here do not account for all comments collected from the public, but only those that are relevant to the Hosmer Project. Likewise, they are not categorized by "positive" or "negative" comments. For example, the "Setting & Experience" category displays the result for both (as paraphrased in the Field Ranger notes above).

Table 9: Comments Compared

Category	Category Total		% of Total	
	1998	1999	1998	1999
Dispersed Camping	10	18	24	12
Boat Ramp/Parking	2	32	5	24
Islands	0	4	0	3
Liabilities	0	8	0	6
Hazard Trees	1	19	2	14
Day Use	0	1	0	1
Dust	1	1	2	1
Fees	1	2	2	2
Concessionaire	4	4	10	3
Dispersed Campfires	1	2	2	2
Regulations	1	7	2	5
Fire Hazard	1	2	2	2
Use Limits	2	20	5	15
Setting & Experience	18	14	43	10
GRAND TOTALS:	42	134	100%	100%

GOTO

- [Chapter I](#)
- [Chapter II](#)
- [Chapter III](#)
- [Chapter IV](#)
- [Chapter V](#)
- [Chapter VI](#)
- [Chapter VII](#)
- [Chapter VIII](#)
- [Appendix A](#)
- [Appendix B](#)
- Appendix C
- [Appendix D](#)

- [Appendix E](#)
- [Appendix F](#)
- [Appendix G](#)
- [Appendix H](#)
- [Appendix I](#)

[Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests Website](#)

<http://www.fs.fed.us/centraloregon/manageinfo/nepa/documents/bendfort/hosmer/appendixc.html>

Last Update: 6/11/01

R.A. Jensen

HOSMER LAKE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVISION TO THE CASCADE LAKES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX D

FOREST SERVICE RESPONSE TO PROVINCIAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

File Code: 1950

Date: March 31, 2000

TO: Deschutes Provincial Advisory Committee

Thank you for the recommendations you recently provided us regarding management of the Hosmer Lake area. The Forest Service recognizes the level of effort required to reach consensus in an arena that has become so emotionally charged. I'd like to express my personal appreciation for the time devoted to this subject by the Hosmer Lake Working Group, the Hosmer Lake Subcommittee and the full Deschutes Provincial Advisory Committee in agreeing to the final commitments contained in your recommendations. My staff and I look forward to continuing to work with the PAC to implement the recommendations we have adopted.

I'd like to address each of the recommendations in detail, but will start by identifying that many of the recommendations are based on common goals shared by the Forest Service. The overall goals recommended by the PAC for Hosmer Lake are the same goals the Forest Service has expressed from the beginning of the analysis process for Hosmer Lake. Beginning with the Cascade Lakes Watershed Assessment, the Forest Service has, in various mediums, emphasized that Hosmer Lake is a special place, with special and unique values. However, I recognize that although common goals can be shared, that does not always include a shared vision of how those goals are accomplished. I also recognize that there have been actions taken in the past at the Hosmer Lake Campgrounds that have seemed, to some, to be overzealous in regards to public safety at the expense of those special values. This, coupled with

the visual evidence of the effect of the removal of trees associated with beetle kill in other Cascade Lakes campgrounds, has resulted in some very vocal concern about whether the specific management practices the Forest Service uses will meet those common goals, and a lack of trust in how those goals are being considered when practices are implemented. The Deschutes Provincial Advisory Committee has been instrumental in helping to implement a process that is designed to minimize the impacts associated with the beetle kill in Hosmer, and increase the public's trust in how we implement those actions.

Overall, the Deschutes Provincial Advisory Committee recommendations represent a mixture of goals, objectives, and recommended actions that will be addressed in various ways by the Bend/Ft. Rock Ranger District. Some of the recommendations, such as the hazard tree process, have been evolving over the last two years, and are virtually already in place. Others will be addressed through the Hosmer Lake Environmental Assessment that is currently in preparation. However, the recommendations, in some cases, exceed the scope of the Environmental Assessment which, because of funding and other biological issues, was reduced from the scope identified in the Cascade Lakes Restoration Environmental Assessment. Those recommendations not addressed through the Environmental Assessment will be addressed through other methods that I have detailed below.

Hosmer Lake Environmental Assessment:

The Hosmer Lake Environmental Assessment will include descriptions of the long term management goals of the lake and its environs. That will incorporate the language provided included in *Recommendation #1 (Long Term Goals)*. This will be coupled with descriptions of desired conditions represented by the Northwest Forest Plan and the Deschutes Land and Resource Management Plan. *Recommendation #2 (Parking Problems/Site Restoration)*, *Recommendation # 3 (Control of Dispersed Camping/Island Use)* will be incorporated virtually in their entirety as Alternative C in the Environmental Assessment. I will not, however, include such detailed specifics as the sign material or wording in the Environmental Assessment. Signing material is highly variable, and will be chosen based on the available funds, site conditions, and durability considerations. Given these considerations, we will try to accommodate the spirit of the recommendation in terms of sign visibility and appropriate message. *Recommendations#7 (Areas between Campgrounds)*, *#8 (Monitoring of Guided and Non-Guided Use)* and *#9 (Monitoring Impacts of Recreational Use)*, and *#11 (Revegetation)* will also be addressed in the Environmental Assessment to various extents.

Recommendation #7 is included as a general goal for the management of the Hosmer Lake area, despite the fact that no activities are proposed in the area called, "Between the Camps". Recognizing the unique values of those areas is important to the Deschutes Provincial Advisory Committee, and therefore the stated goals of the Northwest Forest Plan Riparian Reserves were highlighted for those areas although they apply equally to other Riparian Reserves. Part of *Recommendation #7* includes direction to the Monitoring Subcommittee that is not contained in the Hosmer Environmental Assessment.

Parts of Recommendation #8 will be included in the monitoring section of the Environmental

Assessment. This issue of monitoring group and outfitted use was raised throughout the Environmental Assessment process. Although it is technically outside of the scope of the Environmental Assessment, I recognize that we have little data to support a substantive evaluation of the issue. Therefore, in response to the public comment and Deschutes Provincial Advisory Committee recommendation, I am including in the Environmental Assessment a discussion of the proposed monitoring strategy to gather that information, and to meet the spirit of Recommendation #8.. It is my intent to include Recommended Actions *a, b, and c* in the monitoring section of the Environmental Assessment. The process outlined in Recommended Actions *d and e* relate to separate decisions concerning the issuance of special use permits and describe processes that are currently in place. In all cases, requests for temporary permits would be reviewed prior to approval, and must clearly identify their need.

Recommendations #9 and #11 are also partially addressed in the Hosmer Environmental Assessment. Elements of ongoing campground maintenance are described in a section labeled "Common to All Alternatives". It is in this section that those elements that most relate to long-term management of the campground are described in more detail. The section includes a description of desired conditions relating to campsites and riparian vegetation, and describes actions to prevent campground sprawl and revegetate or restore impacted areas that will occur under normal campground maintenance. This description will include consultation with botanists and reforestation as well as recreation planners. In addition, the Environmental Assessment will include monitoring elements relating to the specific activities decided upon in the Environmental Assessment.

I fully support the idea of including user groups (*Recommendation 11b*) in the restoration efforts for areas that don't meet the desired vegetation conditions. As timing and personnel permit, these avenues will be explored. We also have a very active Youth Conservation Corp that we try and keep busy with these kinds of activities every summer.

The request for a long-term management plan for Hosmer Lake will not be fully met with this Environmental Assessment because the funding allocated for this EA did not cover the analysis that would be needed for a comprehensive management plan. Declining budgets and the emphasis on directing funding toward larger-scale ecosystem assessments make it unlikely that the District will soon receive enough funding to complete a comprehensive management plan. However, funding will be requested. In the interim the decisions made through the EA and the guidance provided by the Northwest Forest Plan and the Deschutes Forest Plan will constitute the management direction for Hosmer.

It should be noted that the recommendations included in Alternative C of the Environmental Assessment will be part of a public decision-making process that may or may not result in selection of that Alternative as the final decision. The public and the Deschutes Provincial Advisory Committee will have two opportunities to comment on the Alternatives - once when the alternatives are sent out for a brief public review, and for the normal 30-day comment period when the entire Environmental Assessment will be sent out for review. Right now, the alternatives are scheduled to be sent out around the end of March, while the Environmental Assessment is expected to be available for public comment in May, 2000.

Hazard Tree and Down Wood Management

As I mentioned before, the Deschutes Provincial Advisory Committee has been instrumental in helping to develop a process for involving the public in hazard tree review in the Hosmer Lake Campground that has helped to alleviate much of the public concern over the range of possible outcomes of hazard tree treatment. That process has been pretty much in place now for over a year, and I have formalized the process as management direction on the District through the attached letter (Hazard Tree Process for Hosmer Lake Campground). The letter incorporates the Deschutes Provincial Advisory Committee *Recommendations #5(Hazard Tree Management) and #6 (Down Woody Material)* virtually in their entirety, although not in the same format or necessarily verbatim. In some cases, I found the language of the recommendations to be unclear or so focused as to eliminate what I feel are some very viable management options that would still achieve the overall spirit and objectives of the goals for Hosmer. While I recognize and appreciate the time and attention that went into crafting the language in the recommendation, I did not in all cases find it suitable or appropriate as management direction as presented. I have tried to the best of my ability to incorporate what I understand to be the spirit of the recommendations. It is not my intention, by combining these elements with elements of your recommendations, to represent these additions or changes as the Deschutes Provincial Advisory Committee recommendations. The Committee and Working Group recommendations will appear as submitted to the Forest Supervisor in an Appendix to the Hosmer Environmental Assessment.

Part d. of Recommendation #5 caused me some concern because there was no consideration of cost as a factor when identifying the feasible ways to treat a hazard tree. If a hazard tree cannot be topped without unduly high costs, less expensive alternatives such as felling the tree will need to be considered, and I have added that consideration to the process. In addition, I have added elements to my direction to the District that were not a part of the Deschutes Provincial Advisory Committee recommendations, but which I feel are necessary points of guidance to personnel regarding hazard tree, down wood, and fuels management in the area.

Included in this guidance is my stated intent to continue the public notification and review process as long as there is sufficient public interest. While I have every interest in maintaining the public review process while it serves the stated goals, it requires a higher level of staff support and therefore cost than would be reasonably warranted if there was less public concern. My hope is that continued demonstration of good faith efforts in implementing the process and visible outcomes that achieve the goals will increase public trust to the extent that annual tree-by-tree reviews are no longer necessary.

Part e. of Recommendation #5 is direction to the Deschutes Provincial Advisory Committee that is outside of my authority to implement

Recommendation #6 is also incorporated into the letter of direction, with the addition of a discussion of the general rule I have adopted for fuel loadings within the campgrounds..As discussed with the Deschutes Provincial Advisory Committee and the public on earlier hazard tree reviews, I have evaluated and can accept leaving fuel loads on the ground that, on average, do not exceed about 8-10

tons per acre. I have included this guideline for personnel involved in making removal decisions for down wood within the campground areas. I have also included an expanded discussion of the use of mechanical removal methods, the conditions under which those methods might be used, and a slightly expanded discussion of the use of commercial operations. I am frankly uncertain whether, given the volume of dead trees that can be expected in the campgrounds in the wake of the mountain pine beetle attack, hand crews at our disposal will be able to complete the work in a timely manner that will not interfere with the reasonable operation of the campgrounds. And although there is a place for horse logging, it is not necessarily the best option in all cases. It was not clear to me the exact area to which *Part h.* applies, but I have included the recommendation as a part of an expanded discussion of the general considerations to be included in future evaluations of fuel loadings and treatments outside of the Riparian Reserve around Hosmer Lake.

Additional Recommended Actions

Recommendation #4 (Fire Suppresion/Forest Health Zones) recommended that a range of treatment prescriptions for additional fuel and/or forest health treatments be evaluated in the Hosmer Environmental Assessment. Unfortunately, this recommendation is not feasible to include in the present EA because funding allocated for this fiscal year is not adequate to cover the additional analysis that would be required, particularly in light of new species survey requirements. We will seek funding for the next fiscal year to analyze a range of treatment prescriptions for this area. If we receive the funding, any proposals for treatment will be done through the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, and an opportunity for public comment will be provided before selecting a final alternative.

Recommendation #10 (Establishing Baseline Documentation) was accomplished as recommended in June of 1999. Photographic documentation will continue for the next three years and as necessary after that to evaluate campsite conditions within the campgrounds, and evaluate the effectiveness of the down wood guidelines and chainsaw prohibitions.

In conclusion, I would like once again to express my appreciation to the Deschutes Provincial Advisory Committee for their efforts to developing the recommendations for Hosmer Lake, and in helping to continue to provide input to the District concerning the management issues at the Lake.

Sincerely,

WALTER C. SCHLOER, JR.
District Ranger

GOTO

- [Chapter I](#)
- [Chapter II](#)
- [Chapter III](#)
- [Chapter IV](#)
- [Chapter V](#)
- [Chapter VI](#)
- [Chapter VII](#)
- [Chapter VIII](#)
- [Appendix A](#)
- [Appendix B](#)
- [Appendix C](#)
- [Appendix D](#)
- [Appendix E](#)
- [Appendix F](#)
- [Appendix G](#)
- [Appendix H](#)
- [Appendix I](#)

[Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests Website](#)

<http://www.fs.fed.us/centraloregon/manageinfo/nepa/documents/bendfort/hosmer/appendixd.html>

Last Update: 6/11/01

R.A. Jensen

HOSMER LAKE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVISION TO THE CASCADE LAKES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX E

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC NOTICES

Table 10: Summary of Public Notices for the Hosmer Project.

WHAT	WHERE	WHEN
Hosmer Project Info Flyer.	Posted on Mallard Marsh & South Campground bulletin boards.	Camping Season 1998 & 1999.
Hosmer Project Info Flyer.	Deschutes National Forest Web page.	Summer 1998 through Fall 1999.
Voluntary Comment Forms.	Collected through Field Rangers on Hosmer Lake, at the boat ramp parking area, and in Mallard Marsh and South Campgrounds.	Camping Season 1998 & 1999.
Project Description	Schedule of Projects for the Ochoco and Deschutes National Forests & the Prineville District of the Bureau of Land Management.	Spring 1998 through Winter 2000.

GOTO

- [Chapter I](#)
- [Chapter II](#)
- [Chapter III](#)
- [Chapter IV](#)
- [Chapter V](#)
- [Chapter VI](#)

- [Chapter VII](#)
- [Chapter VIII](#)
- [Appendix A](#)
- [Appendix B](#)
- [Appendix C](#)
- [Appendix D](#)
- [Appendix E](#)
- [Appendix F](#)
- [Appendix G](#)
- [Appendix H](#)
- [Appendix I](#)

[Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests Website](#)

<http://www.fs.fed.us/centraloregon/manageinfo/nepa/documents/bendfort/hosmer/appendixe.html>

Last Update: 6/11/01

R.A. Jensen

HOSMER LAKE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVISION TO THE CASCADE LAKES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX F

MONITORING

Monitoring Criteria

1) Assessment Monitoring Objective: To determine effectiveness of dispersed campsite restoration, closures and information dissemination efforts related to dispersed camping.

Monitoring Type: Implementation and effectiveness.

Methodology: Recreation Planners, Field Rangers and/or volunteers will visit dispersed campsite (open & closed/restored) to determine compliance with the changes decided upon in the Hosmer EA. Use levels will also be determined for dispersed camping. To assist in this effort, a photo record will be developed to track changes over time. Furthermore, contacts will be made with forest visitors. Comment forms will be used to collect data from the public.

Frequency/Duration: Throughout the summer camping season, at least once every two weeks. Use sampling will be determined by randomly selected dates for the summer camping season. Sampling should occur for at least 5 years to determine use averages, trends and preferences.

2) Assessment Monitoring Objective: To determine if the construction of the new 11 vehicle parking area functions as intended.

Monitoring Type: Implementation and effectiveness.

Methodology: Engineers, Landscape Architect, Recreation Planners, Field Rangers and/or volunteers will visit the new parking area to determine if it reduces congestion at the lower parking area and visitor satisfaction levels. Contacts will be made with Forest visitors. Comment forms will be used to collect data from the public.

Frequency/Duration: Throughout the summer camping season, at least once every two weeks.

3) Assessment Monitoring Objective: To determine success of restoration of native vegetation areas protected through the redesign of the parking lot at the boat ramp and use of barriers to control area of vehicular circulation.

Monitoring Type: Implementation.

Methodology: Landscape Architect and Botanist will visit site and use photo points to review re-establishment of plant material and effective protection efforts through barriers.

Frequency/Duration: At the beginning and the end of the summer season for at least the first three years following construction and revegetation efforts.

4) Assessment Monitoring Objective: To determine successful addition of accessible facilities (toilet, parking space, and pathway).

Monitoring Type: Design and Implementation.

Methodology: Forest Accessibility Coordinator to review design and installation of new accessible facilities with consultation from Central Oregon Resources for Independent Living.

Frequency/Duration: During the design and construction phases.

5) Assessment Monitoring Objective: To determine the effectiveness of the screening for the new graveled parking area located at the top of the hill on Forest Road 4625.

Monitoring Type: Design and Implementation

Methodology: Landscape Architect to provide site adjustment in the field of parking area to preserve as effective a vegetative screen as possible with the existing trees on site.

Frequency/Duration: During design and construction phases.

6) Assessment Monitoring Objective: Develop a baseline of information on species occupancy, use patterns, and relative frequency to assist in the identification of future trends, including habitat trends.

Monitoring Type: Design and Implementation.

Methodology: Wildlife Biologist to develop and provide methodologies with assistance from fisheries, botany and recreation specialists. Utilize photo points on the islands and key shoreline areas. Provide

species identification forms to the campground hosts for distribution to interested visitors.

Frequency/Duration: Twice annually; include with bald eagle surveys.

7) Assessment Monitoring Objective: To ensure water quality Best Management Practices (BMPs) are being followed during construction activities.

Monitoring Type: Implementation

Methodology: Construction activities will be inspected for compliance with BMPs by the Contracting Officers Representative or the project manager, contingent upon if the activities are contracted to a private firm or accomplished with Forest Service personnel and equipment. In either case, forest hydrologists or fisheries biologists would assist in the inspection and evaluation.

Frequency/Duration: During construction activities and once following project completion.

GOTO

- [Chapter I](#)
- [Chapter II](#)
- [Chapter III](#)
- [Chapter IV](#)
- [Chapter V](#)
- [Chapter VI](#)
- [Chapter VII](#)
- [Chapter VIII](#)
- [Appendix A](#)
- [Appendix B](#)
- [Appendix C](#)
- [Appendix D](#)
- [Appendix E](#)
- Appendix F
- [Appendix G](#)
- [Appendix H](#)
- [Appendix I](#)

[Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests Website](http://www.fs.fed.us/centraloregon/manageinfo/nepa/documents/bendfort/hosmer/appendixf.html)

<http://www.fs.fed.us/centraloregon/manageinfo/nepa/documents/bendfort/hosmer/appendixf.html>

Last Update: 6/11/01

R.A. Jensen

HOSMER LAKE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVISION TO THE CASCADE LAKES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX G

BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

Best Management Practices were developed to ensure compliance with state water quality standards and to protect the beneficial uses of waterways.

Listed below are Best Management Practices (BMPs) applicable to the Hosmer Lake Project:

T-21. Servicing and Refueling of Equipment

Summary: Objective is to prevent pollutants such as fuels from entering water bodies during construction activities. Select servicing and refueling areas well away from water and riparian areas. Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures (SPCC) Plan is required if the volume of fuel exceeds 660 gallons in a single container or if the total storage at a site exceeds 1320 gallons.

R-2. Erosion Control Plan

Summary: Objective is to limit and mitigate erosion and sedimentation through effective planning and contract administration during road construction activities. The contractor is to submit a plan prior to construction that outlines measures to be used to control erosion. The mitigation measures are to be included in contract specifications and provisions.

R-3. Timing of Construction Activities

Summary: Objective is to minimize erosion by conducting construction operations during minimal runoff periods. Equipment should not be operated when ground conditions would result in excessive damage. For Hosmer Lake, the timing of construction within the parking area near the boat ramp should coincide when the lake level is receded to reduce impacts to water quality and riparian vegetation. The lake is normally at its highest during mid to late summer.

R-7. Control of Surface Road Drainage Associated with Roads

Summary: Objectives are to minimize erosive forces of water concentrated by road drainage features, disperse runoff from or through the road, and to minimize the sediment generated from the road. Construction techniques such as ditches, cross drains, water bars, dips, and grade sags are used to take water off the roadbed surface.

R-18. Maintenance of Roads

Summary: The objective is to maintain roads to protect water quality. Deteriorating roads can lead to sedimentation of water bodies. Actions could include resurfacing, controlling placement of waste material, outsloping, clearing debris from ditches and cross drains, restoration of ditches, and spot rocking.

R-19. Road Surface Treatment

Summary: The objective is to minimize erosion of road surface materials by wind and precipitation. Road surface treatments may include grading, watering, sealing, chip sealing, paving, aggregate surfacing, dust oiling, or penetration oiling.

W-9. Surface Erosion Control at Facility Sites

Summary: The objective is to minimize the erosion and sedimentation at developed sites such as campgrounds and parking areas. Methods may include seeding, jute mesh, tackifiers, hydromulch, paving or rocking of roads, water bars, cross drains, or retaining walls.

Rec-3. Management of Sanitation Facilities

Summary: The objective is to protect surface and subsurface water from bacteria, nutrients, and chemical pollutants related to sewage collection and disposal. Toilet facilities should be located, designed, constructed, and operated to minimize possibility of water contamination.

Rec-8. Protection of Water Quality Within Developed and Dispersed Recreation Areas

Summary: To protect water quality by regulating the discharge and disposal of potential pollutants. Substances such as human and animal waste, petroleum products, or other hazardous substances shall not be placed in or near water bodies. The public will be encouraged and educated through signing, pamphlets, and public contact to conduct their activities in a manner that does not degrade water quality.

Complete descriptions of BMPs are listed in the Pacific Northwest Region publication General Water Quality Best Management Practices, 1988.

GOTO

- [Chapter I](#)
- [Chapter II](#)
- [Chapter III](#)
- [Chapter IV](#)
- [Chapter V](#)
- [Chapter VI](#)
- [Chapter VII](#)
- [Chapter VIII](#)
- [Appendix A](#)
- [Appendix B](#)
- [Appendix C](#)
- [Appendix D](#)
- [Appendix E](#)
- [Appendix F](#)
- [Appendix G](#)
- [Appendix H](#)
- [Appendix I](#)

[Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests Website](#)

<http://www.fs.fed.us/centraloregon/manageinfo/nepa/documents/bendfort/hosmer/appendixg.html>

Last Update: 6/11/01

R.A. Jensen

HOSMER LAKE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVISION TO THE CASCADE LAKES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX H

HOSMER FACILITY DEVELOPMENT LEVEL

As described in Appendix 3 of the Deschutes Land and Resource Management Plan, the Hosmer Lake area facilities falls within Development Level 3 - Moderately Modified.

Table 11: Development Level 3 Description

Environmental Modification	Recreation Experience
Site modification moderate. Facilities about equal for protection of site and comfort of users. Contemporary/rustic design of improvements is usually based on use of native materials. Inconspicuous vehicular traffic controls usually provided. Roads may be hard surfaced and trails formalized. Development density about three family units per acre. Primary access to site may be over high standard well-traveled roads. VIS, if available is informal and incidental.	Forest environment is essentially natural. Important that a degree of solitude is combined with some opportunity to socialize with others. Controls and regimentation provided for safety and well being of user sufficiently obvious to afford a sense of security but subtle enough to leave the taste of adventure.

GOTO

- [Chapter I](#)
- [Chapter II](#)
- [Chapter III](#)
- [Chapter IV](#)

- [Chapter V](#)
- [Chapter VI](#)
- [Chapter VII](#)
- [Chapter VIII](#)
- [Appendix A](#)
- [Appendix B](#)
- [Appendix C](#)
- [Appendix D](#)
- [Appendix E](#)
- [Appendix F](#)
- [Appendix G](#)
- [Appendix H](#)
- [Appendix I](#)

[Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests Website](#)

<http://www.fs.fed.us/centraloregon/manageinfo/nepa/documents/bendfort/hosmer/appendixh.html>

Last Update: 6/11/01

R.A. Jensen

HOSMER LAKE ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT REVISION TO THE CASCADE LAKES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

APPENDIX I

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

File Code: 1950/36 CFR 215.6 (d,e)

Subject: Hosmer Revision Project Environmental Assessment (EA)

Introduction

The 30-day comment period for the Hosmer Revision Project EA ended on March 9, 2001. The Notice of Public Comment Period appeared in The Bulletin on February 6, 2001.

The Forest Service has documented and analyzed the comments received to the EA. This document describes the substantive comments received and provides the agency's response to those comments. This complies with section 40 CFR 1503.4, Response to Comments, of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations.

Background

During the comment period on the EA, the public submitted 17 separate pieces of input, called "responses". Responses were received in the form of letters and e-mail.

Content Analysis

Content analysis is a systematic method of compiling, categorizing, and capturing the full range of public viewpoints and concerns about the EA. Content analysis helps the interdisciplinary team

organize, clarify, analyze, and be responsive to information the public provides to the agency.

The content analysis process is not a vote-counting measure. The process is designed to read each response, capture the meaning of each individual comment within the response, and provide that meaning to the interdisciplinary team (IDT) and decision-maker in a clear, understandable form.

The interdisciplinary team provided any recommendations for improvements to the EA or documentation to the decision-maker for review, consideration, and action. In general, the agency responded in 3 basic ways to the substantive public comments as prescribed in 40 CFR 1503.4.

1. **Supplementing, improving, or modifying the analysis that the EA documented.** These are identified and discussed in the following table. The comments and subsequent responses were in regard to a variety of topics, some of which are part of the Hosmer project, others that are outside the scope and/or addressed in other processes.
2. **Making Factual Corrections.** As per a previous discussion between the Forest Service and appellants of the Cascade Lakes Restoration Environmental Assessment (as per notes documented on 8/26/97), I am pulling that portion of Alternative 4 that proposes the development and placement of interpretive signs at Hosmer Lake. As per Point 6 from the notes from the 8/26/97 meeting, signing would be limited to relevant policies and regulations rather than providing interpretive information about the lake and its environs.
3. **Explaining why the comments do not need further Forest Service response.** Some of the comments referred to an option or alternative considered but not analyzed in detail, as explained in Chapter 5 of the EA. Other comments addressed processes that were previously put in motion (i.e. hazard tree management, campground concession) that alleviated any need to address them in the EA.

As part of the comment analysis, each piece of correspondence was logged and comments placed in a category. Generally, responses to the comments were designed to answer questions or to provide reference to analysis contained in the EA, or other documentation. Comments may have been answered singly or in groups, with the aim being to provide as specific a response as possible, while avoiding duplication of responses.

The project file includes a list of the comment letters. This list is available upon request.

Comments and Forest Service Responses

The following table displays the categories of public comments received on the Hosmer Revision EA, and the Forest Service response to those comments.

For additional information, contact Leslie Moscoso, Bend-Fort Rock Ranger District, 1230 NE Third, Ste. A-262, Bend Oregon, 97701, (phone 541-383-4712, email lmoscoso@fs.fed.us, or fax 541-383-4700).

Thank you,

WALTER C. SCHLOER, JR.
 District Ranger

Table 1: Summary of Written Comments to the Hosmer Revision Environmental Assessment.

CATEGORY	PUBLIC COMMENT	FOREST SERVICE RESPONSE
<p>1. EA does not meet goal of improving the recreation experience for visitors.</p>	<p>1. Dust abatement should be done annually in the developed campgrounds. (Public Comment #0)</p>	<p>1. Maintenance of the developed campgrounds was not part of the original proposed action. Dust abatement is performed as part of routine maintenance and, as such, is outside the scope of this project.</p>
	<p>2. The developed campgrounds are the most important recreation facility on the lake. Nothing in the document addresses the2. See #1. Other processes that were previously put in motion (hazard tree management {App. B p. 49}, campground concessions) alleviated any need to address the campgrounds at this time. campgrounds. (Public Comment #s 1, 13)</p>	

	<p>3. EA fails to restore/protect the 2 developed campgrounds. (Public Comment #s 3, 13)</p>	<p>3. See #2.</p>
	<p>4. No discussion on how or who would manage the developed campgrounds. (Public Comment #5)</p>	<p>4. Outside the scope of the project. The campgrounds at Hosmer Lake are part of a 5-year Special Use permit. As such, they are operated and maintained by a private concession. There is no plan to change this situation.</p>
	<p>5. No actions regarding revegetation of the campgrounds. Should replant w/ disease resistant species such as fir & hemlock (Public Comment #s 1, 8, 9)</p>	<p>5. See #2. Any tree species planted are susceptible to some type of attack/impact from insects and disease. Also, where there are some locations that the planting of hemlock or fir could be accomplished, these species will not grow well in the lodgepole type habitat, which take in most of both campgrounds.</p>
<p>2. Removal of hazard trees.</p>	<p>6. Wood should be made available for campers, not for any other personal use. (Public Comment #0)</p>	<p>6. Addressed in the "Hazard Tree Treatment and Review Process" (app. B p. 49). Emphasis is placed on making the wood available for campers, to meet fisheries or recreation facility needs, or for other public benefits.</p>
	<p>7. Loss of recreational value is directly related to removal of hazard trees and down wood (loss of privacy, destroys wildlife habitat, creates dust, encourages foot traffic where there are no established trails, threatens riparian zones). (Public Comment # 1, 13)</p>	<p>7. See #6.</p>

	<p>8. Safety should be weighed against other factors such as loss of habitat for birds and other wildlife, lost privacy & shade, and general deterioration of camping experience. Removal should be rare and carefully done. (Public Comment #3)</p>	<p>8. See #6.</p>
	<p>9. Don't understand the removal of all of the cover that is needed by wildlife. Why isn't this addressed in the EA? (Public Comment #s 5, 11)</p>	<p>9. See #6. Dead and dying trees may provide cover for wildlife, e.g. cavities for birds and bats, cover from predators for small mammals (logs). They generally do not provide thermal or hiding cover for big game. There are adequate amounts of snags and logs in areas adjacent to the project. The size of the area being treated for hazard mitigations is not noteworthy in terms of loss of habitat.</p>
<p>3. Dispersed camping</p>	<p>10. Opposed to dispersed camping. Should be only 6 instead of 8 campsites. (Public Comment #s 1, 13)</p>	<p>10. Dispersed camping is a legitimate use of the Hosmer Lake area. The two extra sites made available in Alternatives 2 & 4 were maintained based on existing use patterns and levels. The current use levels don't warrant the reduction of campsites by more than half of the existing 13 sites. Also, the outlet pond area was selected for these extra sites because it is the most resilient location for them.</p>
	<p>11. The campground host could disperse maps and information about location and availability of campsites. This would enhance visitors' "sense of discovery" by understanding the availability of campsites. (Public Comment #4)</p>	<p>11. This is proposed in Alternatives 2 & 4.</p>
	<p>12. Outlet pound should only have 2 not 4 sites. (Public Comment #s 1, 6, 8 & 9)</p>	<p>12. See #10.</p>

	13. No baseline data exists. Without this baseline, the effectiveness of proposed actions cannot be determined and are therefore premature. (Public Comment #7)	13. Current conditions of dispersed campsites are known. Though no statistically valid baseline data exists on use levels, prudent management actions can still be proposed and implemented where resource conditions are being adversely impacted.
	14. The increase in the amount of sites at the outlet (from 2 to 4 in Alts. 3 & 4) is not explained or justified. Impacts of the 2 added sites were not considered or explained. (Public Comment #7)	14. See #10.
	15. There is no specific plan for restoration of campsites to be closed. (Public Comment #7)	15. Dispersed campsites will be included in the Assessment Monitoring Objective #3. Natural recovery will be the first method used for the revegetation of closed dispersed campsites. If monitoring warrants, hand planting and/or transplanting of native vegetation will be instituted.
	16. Are the dispersed campsites to be closed and revegetated also closed for day use activities? (Public Comment #16)	16. Sites would be temporarily closed to all uses until recovery of vegetation is complete. At which point, the site(s) may be re-opened for day use activities.
4. Signage.	17. Signs should be kept to a minimum to avoid creating a "carnival" atmosphere. (Public Comment #s 1, 11)	17. None of the action alternatives call for more than 3-4 informational signs, depending on alternative. Whenever possible, signs would be posted on the same message board, thus reducing the need for more signboards. Signs would be placed at both parking areas, thereby limiting the number of signs at any one location.

	18. Signs at boat ramp seem excessive. Don't ruin scenery. (Public Comment #s 3, 9, 13)	18. See #17.
	19. Have all information posted at the parking areas. (Public Comment #6)	19. That is what is proposed in all alternatives. Alternatives 2 & 4 also propose informational brochures.
	20. Interpretive signs conflict with long-term goals to preserve experience. Intrusive & would negatively impact experience. Conflicts w/point #6 of the 8/26/97 notes between the appellants of the Cascade Lakes EA and the District Ranger and Assistant District Ranger. Signing for dispersed camping not needed. Interpretive signs will increase recreation use. (Public Comment # 7)	20. After reviewing the reference as per the commenter letter, this Decision will modify the EA by not installing interpretive signs at Hosmer Lake.
	21. Recognize the need for signs/ brochures to inform visitors about changes in camping, regulations and local ecology. (Public Comment #s 8, 10)	21. Signs and brochures are proposed in Alternatives 2 & 4.
5. Islands & eagles.	22. Some means of determining the outcome of the island closure should be provided. Monitoring should be top priority. (Public Comment #s 1, 10, 13)	22. Forms and photo points will be utilized for both wildlife habitat and recreation use monitoring efforts. Eagle: Twice annually in spring and summer. Waterfowl on islands: mid- to late-June and September. Human use on islands: throughout the camping season. To be accomplished by Field Rangers, Forest Service or other biologists, camp host and volunteers.
	23. All islands should be closed for a 5-year study to learn what is really happening to these fragile areas. (Public Comment #6)	23. Use levels and impacts to the 2 southern islands are such that a 5-year closure was not deemed necessary at this time.

<p>24. No consideration given to the practicality of excluding human use on the north island during nesting period. Environmental and human effects of closure not properly addressed; doesn't discuss potential effects to other un-impacted areas that users are displaced to. (Public Comment #7)</p>	<p>24. Monitoring will address both biological and people enforcement and will assist in determining the effectiveness of this proposal. There is some likelihood that the displaced use will impact other areas of low to no use. However, given the terrain of most of the lakeshore area, it is unlikely that use will adversely impact any other areas. Given the environmental ethic that most users to Hosmer share, it is very unlikely that impacts would occur at a site that hasn't already been utilized.</p>
<p>25. Encourages use of the 2 southern most islands outside of the nesting period. Actions that encourage use of these currently pristine areas are not in keeping w/the goals of the EA. (Public Comment #7)</p>	<p>25. See #24. There is currently little evidence of human use at these islands. This will likely persist given the wet conditions found at these islands.</p>
<p>26. The possible impacts of winter recreation use are not addressed. (Public Comment #7)</p>	<p>26. Though there is some winter recreation use that occurs (motorized and non-motorized), use is incidental. There are no designated winter trails to Hosmer. Eagles begin courtship in their territories as early as January. Nest building/reconstruction probably starts in February.</p>

6. Long-range plan.

27. A long-range plan needs to be developed. To include accountability and timelines. (Public Comment #s 1, 9)

27. Though there is no specific long-range plan for Hosmer Lake, there are several documents, including this EA, which identify goals and standards for habitats and environments (Appendix A). Other documents that provide the basis for activities planning for Hosmer and its environs include: the Deschutes Land and Resources Management Plan, the Northwest Forest Plan, and the Cascade Lakes Environmental Assessment.

28. Lack of a long-term plan can lead to inappropriate actions. EA gives no direction or effective vision. (Public Comment #s 3, 7, 13)

28. See #27. The long-term management goals stated in the EA (Need for Action p. 3, Long-Term Goals p. 12) do set the direction and vision for Hosmer Lake.

29. EA does not include a long-term plan as per the notes of 8/26/97 between the appellants of the Cascade Lakes EA and the District Ranger and Assistant District Ranger. (Public Comment #7)

29. See #27. The notes of 8/26/97 do not specify a stand-alone plan for Hosmer Lake. The notes state: "These documents (Hosmer Revision EA and Decision Notice) will identify the long-term management goals and strategies that will guide all actions pertaining to Hosmer Lake" (Need for Action p. 3, Long-Term Goals p. 12). As per the scope of this project, the EA has done just that.

	<p>30. The preferred alternative does not demonstrate a commitment to meeting the long-term management goals. (Public Comment #8)</p>	<p>30. The preferred alternative improves recreation facilities and wildlife habitat, seeking to maintain the quality of the recreation experience that Hosmer currently has to offer. In doing so, it displays commitment to the long-term goals.</p>
<p>7. Brochures.</p>	<p>31. Eliminate brochures and post info at parking areas. (Public Comment #s 2, 6)</p>	<p>31. Brochures are not part of Alternative 3. Information is posted at the parking areas in alternatives 2 & 4.</p>
	<p>32. Brochures will advertise the availability of dispersed campsites. Eliminate brochures. (Public Comment #3, 13)</p>	<p>32. Brochures will help to inform visitors about the special qualities and habitats of Hosmer Lake. Where brochures may inform some visitors of the availability of dispersed camping opportunities, the benefit of informing visitors on the proper camping techniques, campsite locations and information about the ecology will help avoid impacts caused by recreationists.</p>
	<p>33. Maps and brochures dispensed by the CG host would enhance visitors' understanding of the dispersed camping zones, eliminating the need for signage. (Public Comment #4)</p>	<p>33. Alternatives 2 & 4 provide maps and/or brochures to the visitor.</p>
	<p>34. Signs/brochures/maps for dispersed camping aren't needed since use level is fewer than 30%. Will increase litter and use. (Public Comment #s 7, 10, 11)</p>	<p>34. See #32. Even though current use levels are relatively low, the reduction in campsites will increase the occupancy rate of the remaining open sites.</p>

	35. Recognize the need for signs/ brochures to inform visitors about changes in camping, regulations and local ecology. Question the need for brochures. Could cause more litter. (Public Comment #8, 12)	35. See #s 35-38.
8. Fees.	36. Dispersed camping fee could help fund further studies, maintenance, and control of sites. (Public Comment #8)	36. Given the use current use level, the revenue generated from a dispersed camping fee is unlikely to cover the cost of the operations and maintenance of the campsites.
9. Parking.	37. Boat ramp parking is okay as is. Leave alone. (Public Comment #s 2, 6)	37. Does not meet the purpose and need of the project (Need for Action, p. 3).
	38. Support Alts. 3 & 4 which do not sacrifice campsites for parking. (Public Comment #4, 12)	38. Alternative 4 is the preferred alternative.
	39. Proposed parking modifications are not feasible, nor specific enough to direct an action. (Public Comment #7)	39. The cost of constructing the proposed parking area could be accomplished through partnerships, Capital Improvement Funds, or a combination of the two. The site designs are specific enough to construct.
	40. How the revegetation of the boat ramp area is to be done is not delineated. How will this effect canoe launching? What about mitigation if this fragile area is disturbed during rehab? (Public Comment #7)	40. The revegetation at the boat ramp area may only be needed if natural revegetation is not sufficient (See NOTE on p. 18 of EA). There would be no effect to the canoe launch area, as this area is not proposed to be revegetated. Mitigation measures described on p. 18 of the EA will be implemented for this rehab.

	41. Since the lake is used primarily by canoeists, kayakers and tubists, and should be kept this way. Shouldn't provide parking spaces for vehicle plus trailer. (Public Comment #16)	41. In alternatives 3 & 4 the lower parking area will be closed to trailer parking. The upper parking area would provide the needed space for those w/trailers. Even so, the parking stalls may still be used by one or more motor vehicles, thus eliminating their use for trailer parking.
	42. Alt. 2 parking area is more convenient for boat ramp users. Campsites are rarely used. (Public Comment #16)	42. Addressed in Alternative 2.
	43. Replace existing concrete slab boat launch with a simple natural sand/gravel launch. (Public Comment #16)	43. The existing concrete boat ramp is functioning and not causing any adverse environmental impacts so there is no need to replace it at this time.
10. Campfires.	44. Dispersed campfires are dangerous and should be banned. (Public Comment #s 2, 6, 10)	44. Currently, there is a temporary ban on campfires in dispersed campsites at Hosmer. Alternative 3 does ban campfires.
	45. Maybe there would be more camping space if all campfires were banned. Removal of campfire rings would provide space for more campsites, or at least more privacy. (Public Comment #4)	45. Increasing use levels is contrary to the goals for Hosmer Lake. When conditions allow, campfires are appropriate in the developed campgrounds.
	46. No consideration given to impacts of current ban on campfires in regards to dispersed camping use levels. (Public Comment #7)	46. The proposed dispersed campsites to be closed were selected due to their poor location and/or impacts to vegetation or aesthetics, not for their potential for an escaped wildfire.

	<p>47. Alt. 4 is confusing...states same affect as Alt. 3 (campfire ban), though Alt. 4 says the campfire ban would be prohibited until the amount (of dead and standing) was no longer considered a significant fire danger. Need to identify criteria or standard of conditions where campfires would again be allowed (Public Comment # 14)</p>	<p>47. The effects stated on page 41 are not entirely correct. It should state "Alternative 4 would have the same effect as Alternative 3 until the fuel/fire hazard is below 8-10 tons per acre and the arrangement of fuels is suitable to reduce rapid rates of spread (i.e. tonnage is in large fuels, is widely scattered and is close to or in contact with the ground."</p>
	<p>48. Campfires could be allowed under specific conditions. They are also highly social and spiritual to dispersed campers. (Public Comment # 14)</p>	<p>48. This is addressed in Alt. 2 that allows campfires except during times of public use restrictions.</p>
<p>11. Insect management.</p>	<p>49. What is the status of the beetle epidemic? What are the options for beetle control? (Public Comment #4)</p>	<p>49. Beetles are still in and around the Hosmer Lake area. Lodgepole mortality is likely to continue for the next two to five years until most of the larger trees (>9") have died out. Beetle outbreak in lodgepole pine is part of its natural life cycle. Where there are some options to control the effects of beetles, the timeframe for doing this at Hosmer has passed.</p>
	<p>50. Should/can we plant beetle resistant species of trees? (Public Comment #1, 4)</p>	<p>50. Most areas are recovering naturally with lodgepole, which is the habitat type for this area. Beetle resistant species (such as hemlock) are coming up naturally where site conditions favor them. Also, where there are some locations that the planting of hemlock or fir could be accomplished, these species will not grow well in the lodgepole type habitat, which</p>

		take in most of both campgrounds.
12. Previous Discussions.	51. EA does not follow guidelines of the Project Initiation Letter, or the notes of 8/26/97. (Public Comment #7)	51. Where there is a conflict between the EA and previous notes, they have been changed as per this Decision so as there will be no interpretive signs posted at Hosmer Lake.
13. Draft Alternatives.	52. The draft EA was not sufficient or clear enough for the public to make an informed comment. (Public Comment #7)	52. The intent of the draft alternatives was to determine if the range of alternatives was sufficient to meet the purpose and need. As such, only the sections of the EA through the alternatives were mailed. Effects were not complete at the time of the mailing.
	53. Comments received on draft EA were not addressed in the final EA. (Public Comment #7)	53. Some comments to the draft alternatives consisted of casting a ballot rather than providing actual comments. Some comments were outside the scope of the project. Other comments were addressed in the EA or other supporting documents (i.e. specialist reports), or processes (i.e. hazard tree process). These documents are available upon request.
14. Previous comments.	54. Comments received prior to the draft EA are not listed or addressed in the draft EA as required. Does not meet requirements of Federal Regulations (36 CFR 215). (Public Comment #s 7, 13)	54. Some comments were outside the scope of the project. Other comments were been addressed in the EA or other supporting documents (i.e. specialist reports), or processes (i.e. hazard tree process). The Draft Alternatives was sent to the mailing list to determine if it met the intent or scope of the proposed action. As such, all comments were incorporated,

		as appropriate, into the final EA.
15. Other documentation.	55. No specialist reports are included in the EA. (Public Comment #7)	55. Specialist reports are available upon request. They are not sent out as part of the EA. Rather, they are incorporated into the document.
	56. The Forest Service did not properly notify the public of the EAs existence. (Public Comment #7)	56. A notice was mailed to over 60 households on 10/19/00, as well as posting this notice in the Bend Bulletin and on the Deschutes National Forest web page.
	57. No baseline studies available regarding wildlife use. (Public Comment #7)	57. See #60. There are no baseline data in our files, except for some rather recent informal field notes from Marcy Boehme.
	58. No baseline data for dispersed camping, therefore monitoring cannot produce assessment of effects of management decisions. (Public Comment #7)	58. Existing conditions of the dispersed campsites are known. From this, effects of actions can be derived. Statistically valid use figures are not known, but 2 years of use sampling has produced the start of a baseline. This effort will continue for 3 more years.
16. Misc.	59. Monitoring of actions by the concessionaires is not included. (Public Comment #7)	59. Outside the scope of the project. The Special Use administrator of the permit holder accomplishes monitoring of the concession operator.

60. There is no way a twice-yearly survey of vegetation restoration and wildlife use will give an accurate picture of what's happening on the ground. (Public Comment #8)

60. Twice yearly visits will be adequate for monitoring vegetation. Wildlife observations in the spring during migration and later in the year will document occurrence of the majority of species. Supplemental sighting reports by volunteers, recreationists, concessionaire employees, and other FS employees could potentially supplement this data. However, with current limitations of funding and staff it is not reasonable to expect data that will support conclusions on population trends and significance of use of habitats of many species of wildlife at Hosmer. Bald eagle monitoring to document nesting success utilizes the protocol of twice annual visits across the State of Oregon and has successfully monitored trends in productivity and survival. The bald eagle is the only species with federally listed status that is likely to be affected by recreational activities at Hosmer. Species such as neotropical migrant birds, small mammals, predators, etc. cannot be adequately monitored using extensive reconnaissance for a variety of reasons. High intensity monitoring is not warranted for the vast majority of species by the current issues at Hosmer. Furthermore, habitat condition

	<p>indices are sufficient to detect any adverse condition, which may affect their populations and are generally more practical to observe or measure. Finally, it is not advisable to monitor most migratory species population trends at the local level due to the potential influences in other parts of their range.</p>
<p>61. Runoff resulting from prior actions to limit parking on the access road are not addressed. (Public Comment #7)</p>	<p>61. Boat ramp road improvements are addressed in the Common to All Alternatives section.</p>
<p>62. No mention of impacts resulting from plans to gate the campground. (Public Comment #7)</p>	<p>62. The gate installation is to provide for the safety of campers at Mallard Marsh and South campgrounds. With the amount of hazard trees resulting from the beetle-killed lodgepole, the gate will be installed to prevent injury to campers until hazards are mitigated.</p>
<p>63. Liability of dispersed camping caused by "invitations" (brochures, maps) is not addressed (Public Comment #7)</p>	<p>63. The Forest Service uses a variety of media, from news releases to informational flyers, to better inform the public on a variety of topics. Brochures and maps are intended as informational only and not as invitations.</p>

64. No proper understanding of bird and animal habitat. (Public Comment #7)

64. The proposed actions will benefit habitats in the long-term as compared to the current situation. The monitoring described in the EA will assess and identify any remaining issues or opportunities. The overall potential impacts on habitats at Hosmer Lake are minor and will not adversely affect any species, except in a very localized and short-term manner. Other than the bald eagle nest site, there are no known, significant wildlife related issues pertaining to habitats or population trends at Hosmer Lake. The only potential exception to this is the Oregon spotted frog. The lake could potentially provide habitat for this species, if it were not stocked with predatory fish. It is highly unlikely that ODFW or the recreating public would support the elimination of trout and Atlantic salmon in the lake so the issue is moot. In conclusion, Hosmer Lake habitats and associated populations are represented by similar situations in other areas of the Deschutes National Forest. They are valuable assets to the Forest and are certainly unique in comparison to upland forested habitats. However, the proposed actions do not warrant any special studies to qualify or quantify habitat

	attributes, species population levels or trends.
65. Alt. 4 is predominantly a Forest Service alternative, not a PAC alternative. This is misleading. The EA excludes/ ignores more PAC recommendations than it includes. The PAC recommendations are not included in the EA, thus preventing the public from considering it. (Public Comment #7)	65. Alt. 4 differs from alt. 3 in the amount of dispersed campsites allowed (8 instead of 6), and the use of brochures and information signs. Many of the PAC recommendations described in the EA were addressed through other processes (Appendix D p. 63).
66. No assessment/consideration is made on the ways that actions will increase use at the lake. This lack of consideration is a flaw. (Public Comment #7)	66. There would be no increase of use based on actions in the EA. To the contrary, the reduction in the amount of parking will actually limit or reduce use on the lake.
67. No mention of any mitigation to take place if actions do not have the desired effects. (Public Comment #7)	67. Mitigation measures and monitoring sections address this comment. In the likelihood of an unforeseen effect or new effect occurs, it will be addressed at that time through the NEPA process.
68. Proper utilization of many hours of public comments, meetings and official involvement were not made. It's a mystery why the scope of the project remains so limited based on this, and the 8/26/97 notes between the appellants to the Cascade Lakes EA and the District Ranger and Assistant District Ranger. (Public Comment #7)	68. The scope of the project remained as it did since other areas of concern (i.e. hazard trees and campground sprawl), as described through public comments, were being addressed in other forums. As such, they did not need to be included in the EA.

<p>69. Proposed actions are not based upon the three long-term goals. (Public Comment #7)</p>	<p>69. The proposed actions are in keeping with the 3 long-term goals by: improving parking conditions and thereby the recreation experience (reduce congestion), dispersed campsites and riparian and upland vegetation (better aesthetics and improved wildlife habitat).</p>
<p>70. Numerous comments in Appendix C were not addressed in the EA as deemed irrelevant, outside the scope, or N/A. However, many of these seem to have direct relevance in regard to the long-term management goals for the area. (Public Comment #8)</p>	<p>70. See #54.</p>
<p>71. Some comments considered to be outside the scope have been addressed in "other forums". For a long-term management plan to be effective the work of these other forums must be included, lest different goals and standards are applied to the same area. (Public Comment #8)</p>	<p>71. See #54. Other forum outcomes and effects were considered, as needed, in the development of the Hosmer Revision EA.</p>

GOTO

- [Chapter I](#)
- [Chapter II](#)
- [Chapter III](#)
- [Chapter IV](#)
- [Chapter V](#)
- [Chapter VI](#)
- [Chapter VII](#)
- [Chapter VIII](#)

- [Appendix A](#)
- [Appendix B](#)
- [Appendix C](#)
- [Appendix D](#)
- [Appendix E](#)
- [Appendix F](#)
- [Appendix G](#)
- [Appendix H](#)
- Appendix I

[Deschutes and Ochoco National Forests Website](#)

<http://www.fs.fed.us/centraloregon/manageinfo/nepa/documents/bendfort/hosmer/appendixi.html>

Last Update: 6/11/01

R.A. Jensen