

# MILLPOND GROUP CAMPSITE

## Decision Record

An Interdisciplinary (ID) Team of the Swiftwater Field Office, Roseburg District, Bureau of Land Management has analyzed the proposed **Millpond Group Campsite** project. This analysis and the "Finding of No Significant Impact" (FONSI) was documented in Environmental Assessment (EA) No. OR-104-00-09. The thirty day public review and comment period was completed on June 21, 2001. One letter with comments was received as a result of public review.

This proposal is in conformance with the *"Final - Roseburg District Proposed Resource Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/EIS) dated October 1994 and its associated Roseburg District Record of Decision and Resources Management Plan (RMP) dated June 2, 1995.*

The EA analyzes the implementation of the "Proposed Action Alternative". The proposed action involves the construction of a group reservation campsite near the present Millpond Recreation Site. The project will involve construction on 2.5 acres to include nine campsites, access road parking spurs, picnic tables, fire rings, double vault restroom and a play area. A well will also be drilled near this site and an underground irrigation system installed.

The following objectives will be met by this proposal:

1. Meet visitor use needs.
2. Meet American With Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility standards.
3. Use construction standards which will minimize future maintenance needs.
4. Revegetate areas of tree mortality using native tree species which are root rot resistant.
5. Construct camp spurs to accommodate a 26 ft towed trailer at drive-thru sites and a 32 ft trailer in back-in sites.

### Decision

It is my decision to authorize the implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative as outlined in the EA (Section 2.0, pg. 4).

### Decision Rationale

The Proposed Action Alternative meets the objectives and principles set forth in the *"Roseburg District Record of Decision and Resources Management Plan"* (RMP), the *"Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS) on Management of Habitat for Late-Successional and Old Growth Forest Related Species Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl"* (Feb. 1994) and the Record of Decision (ROD) for that plan dated April 13, 1994.

The No Action alternative was not selected because the EA did not identify any impacts of the Proposed

Action that would be beyond those identified in the EIS. The No Action alternative would not meet the need to provide accommodations for reserved group camping. Cultural clearances have been completed according to protocol. No consultation was required.

Consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) was not required because expected effects to listed species or to critical habitat was analyzed as being minor, insignificant or negligible.

This decision is based on the fact that the Proposed Action Alternative implements the Management Actions / Directions of the RMP, however, the impacts to resource values would not exceed those identified in the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS). The project design features as stated in the EA would mitigate the issues identified in the EA (Section 1.4, pg. 2).

Comments were solicited from affected State and local government agencies. No comments were received. During the thirty day public review period, comments were received from Umpqua Watersheds, Inc. None of the comments provided new information which should be considered in this decision. None of the comments provided new information, showed flawed analysis or assumptions, or an error in data that would alter the conclusions of our analysis thereby requiring new analysis or reconsideration of the proposed action. Several comments warrant clarification:

- The Millpond Group Campsite EA failed to consider the impacts of encouraging more recreational vehicles (RV's) to be bought and driven. This would include the gas burned contributing to global warming, as well as vehicle size contributing to highway congestion.

This issue is beyond the scope of this analysis. The National Environmental Protection Act (CEQ Regulation 40 CFR 1500.1 para. (b)) requires that documents “concentrate on issues that are truly significant to the action in question rather than amassing needless detail.” The effects of encouraging more RV's to be bought and used and effects on global warming would be remote and speculative and would not add substantive information to this analysis. This site will not accommodate large numbers of RVs (only nine sites) and lacks hookups such as water, sewer, phone, and electric connections that the more developed commercial sites provide. Some RV owners may prefer a more developed site than what Millpond will provide.

- The EA failed to consider the cumulative effects of more RV's to the recreational experience of campers wanting a smaller, simpler camping experience.

The comments received were critical of RV use and lack of “. . . fun in pitching a tent next to a hunk of metal humming with an electric generator and glowing with the lights of a TV.” “Tent campers are often forced into this because all the best places are made RV accessible.” The BLM acknowledges conflicts between various modes of camping. The advantage of the group reservation site is that a group of tent campers can essentially reserve an entire campground for their use and not have to contend with any RV's if they so choose. As always, those campers who want a smaller, simpler camping experience may opt to find an isolated, undeveloped dispersed site in the forest.

- The EA failed to address how trees in the expanded campground will be protected.  
Protection of resources in a campground, such as trees, are protected by law in the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 8365.1-5 under Property and Resources. According to this document, “No person shall willfully deface, disturb, remove or destroy plants or their parts, soil, rock.”etc. Law enforcement officers may patrol and issue citations or make arrests based on the severity of this infraction. The EA did not analyze the protection of trees because it is provided for in federal regulation.
- There are unknown, possibly hazard wastes in the vicinity of the expansion.  
The entire site was subjected to an on-the-ground Level I HAZMAT survey by the District Environmental Protection Specialist. No hazardous materials were found and no further surveys were recommended. Umpqua Watersheds identified a potential hazardous waste site to the Resource Area. This site in fact was a mile upstream from this site.

Compliance and Monitoring

Monitoring will be conducted as per the guidance given in the ROD and the RMP.

Appeal Procedures

This decision may be appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of the Secretary, 1849 C Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20240. If an appeal is taken, notice of appeal must be filed in this office within 30 days after the legal notice announcing the availability of this Decision Record appears in *The News Review*. The appellant has the burden of showing that the decision appealed from is in error.

---

Jay K. Carlson, Field Manager  
Swiftwater Field Office

---

Date