

## **Decision Record**

### **Bassar Diggins Deferred Maintenance Environmental Assessment OR-035-04-10**

#### **Vale District Bureau of Land Management Baker Field Office Baker City, Oregon**

This decision record documents my decision to adopt the Bassar Diggins Deferred Maintenance project as described as the Proposed Action in the Environmental Assessment (EA) OR-035-04-10. Included in my decision are mitigation measures identified by my staff.

The project area has been surveyed for cultural resources. Ground disturbing activities will be monitored. Any cultural sites unexpectedly found will be avoided and as such no impacts to cultural resources will occur. The EA is tiered to and the project is within the bounds of the Baker Resource Management Plan (RMP) Record of Decision (ROD, 1989) and the Ironside Rangeland Program Summary (RPS, 1981).

#### **Public Comments Review**

Permittees who have grazing permits in the Bassar Diggins area were contacted to discuss the new fence project and livestock grazing within the Bassar Diggins recreation site. The BLM also discussed what sections of fence each permittee would be responsible for maintaining. A signed co-op agreement will be completed to document this.

Subsequent to the preparation of the EA, a Legal Notice setting forth the EA's availability for public comments was published. The EA was also posted on the Vale District website. During the 30-day public comment period, no comments were received.

#### **Decision**

My decision is to select the Proposed Action alternative which is to replace and improve recreation facilities at Bassar Diggins camp site and to replace the associated exclosure fence. This decision is based upon the interdisciplinary analysis contained in the Environmental Assessment OR-035-03-02, a copy of which is attached or which may be obtained on the Vale District website ([www.or.blm.gov/Vale](http://www.or.blm.gov/Vale)), as well as the supporting record, and field review.

All mitigating measures, stipulations, design features, and monitoring described in the EA are incorporated into project implementation plans. Among these are:

- Monitor impacts at the spring. If necessary, build a fence to protect the spring.
- Cultural resources will be avoided and vault toilet replacement will be monitored. Additional cultural resource evaluation and avoidance measures will be developed and completed prior to implementation of any new recreation site facilities or improvements in the vicinity of known sites.
- Apply standard weed control measures.
- Seed all disturbed areas with an approved seed mixture. This would reduce erosion and retard weed invasion.

One action alternative and a no action alternative were considered. The no action alternative was not chosen because active management is needed to ensure a quality recreation experience, protect public health and safety, and to improve livestock management within the camp site. With the BLM's responsibility for sound management of public land, the no action alternative was not practical.

### **Decision Rationale**

The proposed project will have no effects on Areas of Critical Environmental Concerns, Cultural Resource, Prime Farmlands, Threatened and Endangered Animals, Threatened and Endangered Plants, Native American Treaty Rights, Hazardous Wastes, Wild and Scenic Rivers, or Wilderness Areas.

Vegetation will be affected during project implementation but will be short lived and confined to the immediate vicinity of ground disturbance and elimination of timber that poses a hazard to the public. If sediment is produced during construction, there could be an affect on fisheries habitat. Affects on wildlife will include temporary disruption during construction.

Elimination of the existing trough and providing a potable water hand pump will have an affect on water quality by reducing sediment delivery to the creek. However, indiscriminate use of the creek to water livestock may cause affects to the riparian area. Mitigation measures are in place to reduce this impact if needed.

Short term impacts may affect the recreating public during construction, but after construction, the public will be offered quality sanitation facilities, level campsites, and potable water.

No disproportionately high adverse human or environmental impact on minority or low-income populations or Indian tribes is likely to result from the proposed action. This plan meets none of the criteria for significance. This action is consistent with the Baker Resource Area Management Plan (1989) Record of Decision.

## Appeal Rights

This decision may be appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of the Secretary, in accordance with the regulations contained in 43 CFR 4.21 (58 FR 4939, January 19, 1993), for a stay (suspension) of effectiveness of this decision during the time that your appeal is being reviewed by the Board, the petition for a stay must accompany your notice of appeal. A petition for a stay is required to show sufficient justification based on the standards listed below. Copies of the notice of appeal and petition for a stay must also be submitted to each party named in this decision and to the Interior Board of Land Appeals and to the appropriate Office of the Solicitor (see 43 CFR 4.413) at the same time the original documents are filed with this office. If you request a stay, you have the burden of proof to demonstrate that a stay should be granted.

Except as otherwise provided by law or other pertinent regulation, a petition for a stay of a decision pending appeal shall show sufficient justification based on the following standards:

- (1) The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied,
- (2) The likelihood of the appellant's success on the merits,
- (3) The likelihood of immediate and irreparable harm if the stay is not granted, and,
- (4) Whether the public interest favors granting the stay.

/s/ Penelope Dunn Woods

8/6/04

---

Penelope Dunn Woods  
Field Manager  
Baker Field Office, Vale District BLM

---

Date