DECISION RECORD
Split Rock Bench Install
DOI-BLM-OR-134-2012-DNA-0035
Bureau of Land Management
Wenatchee Field Office
915 Walla Walla
Wenatchee, Washington

1. Background

BLM has been approached by a local bass fishing group who would like to donate a concrete bench at BLM's Split Rock recreation site in memory of a deceased fellow member. BLM met with representatives of the group to discuss details of the bench, location for installation, and installation itself. Installing the bench will add a low maintenance structure to BLM's recreation site, which will benefit visitors to the site. Additional seating is especially needed during the June-July period each year, when high water from the lake covers the beach, leaving the only available seating at the picnic tables around the edge of the parking lot. The bench will provide views of the lake to visitors who may not wish to go down the stairs to the beach, and will be accessible to people with disabilities.

2. Decision

It is my decision to install one concrete bench at the east edge of the Split Rock parking area, within the gravel picnic area. Two holes will be dug, approximately 2 feet deep in the gravel fill. The bench will be installed, with concrete placed around the legs of the bench to stabilize it. Holes will be backfilled and gravel raked across the top, to ensure an undisturbed appearance. The bench will be installed in the gravel picnic area near the boat ramp, which was constructed in 2005.

3. Authority

This proposed action is subject to the Spokane District Resource Management Plan (1985), its Record of Decision (ROD)(1987), and its RMP Plan Amendment (1992) and ROD (1992), specifically Chapter 2; General Management Objectives: 7: Manage public lands for increasing recreational uses and keep access routes open for a variety of recreational opportunities/experiences, including both motorized and nonmotorized recreation activities.

4. Rationale

It is my decision to approve the Split Rock Bench Installation, because this action meets the need and will accomplish the purposes for action specifically provided for in the Split Rock Site Improvements EA OR134-05-EA-011 (June 2005), which gives direction to "…repair, replace or improve the majority of deteriorating facilities at this location, including the outhouse, parking area and site entrance. The improved site will accommodate current and increased recreational use of this site." Among the items analyzed in the EA's Proposed Action, numerous site improvements were listed, including:

- Replace 2 existing wooden outhouses with one double concrete vault toilet. Locate new outhouse west of present location, at edge of filled area. Remove old outhouses.
- Eliminate east entrance to recreation site at blind corner by placing DOT-approved barrier across. Enlarge and improve west entrance to be the main entrance to the site.
- Create gravel walkway around the north (lake) edge of the parking lot, to create a safe place for pedestrians to access picnic tables, outhouses and stairs to beach.
- Add extra sheltered picnic table area near east stairs.
- Add interpretive signing and second informational bulletin board.

The proposed bench is a similar site improvement as those analyzed in the 2005 EA. Impacts for this action are expected to be similar to those analyzed in the 2005 EA, and will not cause significant impacts to the environment, as determined in the Finding of No Significant Impacts for the previous decision.

5. Public Involvement

The June 2005 Split Rock Improvements EA (OR134EA-11) was made available for public comments for 2 weeks, and none were received.

6. Coordination and Consultation

Consultation for installation of the Split Rock boat ramp was initiated with the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, the Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, and the Okanogan County Historical Society by letters dated June 6, 2002. The Okanogan County Historical Society responded with a letter dated June 17, 2002 which stated that the organization was not aware of any "features of Historic interest that might be affected by the proposed

work". Consultation on the [Split Rock Boat Ramp2005 Split Rock Site Improvements EA (OR134-EA-11)] present project was initiated by letters dated July 15, 2004 to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, the Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (OAHP) and the Okanogan County Historical Society. OAHP replied with a letter dated July 20, 2004 in which OAHP concurred with BLM's definition of the Area of Potential Effect. A Cultural Resources report on the combined boat ramp and other improvements projects has been completed.

Consultation for installation of the Split Rock bench was initiated with the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, and the Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation by letters dated September 7, 2012. On October 9, 2012 the Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation responded thaty they concur with "Determination of No Historic Properties Affected".

7. Administrative Review or Appeal Opportunities

Any party that is adversely affected and determined to be a party to the case, may appeal the implementation of the proposed action to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of the Secretary, in accordance with the regulations contained in 43 CFR Part 4. A notice of appeal must be filed in this office (see letterhead address) within 30 days of receipt of this decision. The appellant has the burden of showing that the decision is in error.

An appellant may also file a petition for a stay (suspension) of this decision during the time that the appeal is being reviewed by the Board pursuant to Part 4, Subpart B, 43 CFR Part 4.21. The petition for a stay must accompany the 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 be submitted to each party named in this decision, to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, and the Office of the Solicitor (see 43 CFR 4.413) at the same time the original documents are filed with this office. The appellant has the burden of proof of demonstrating that a stay should be granted.

Standards for Obtaining a Stay:

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

(a) The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied,

(b) The likelihood of the appellant's success on the merits,

(c) The likelihood of immediate and irreparable harm if the stay is not granted, and

(d) Whether the public interest favors granting the stay.

Attachment: Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

/s/ Linda Coates-Markle November 5, 2012

_____ _____

Linda Coates-Markle Date
Field Manager

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management, Spokane District
1103 North Fancher Road
Spokane Valley, WA 99212

A. Background

BLM Office: Wenatchee Field Office

Lease/Serial/Case File No.:

NEPA Log Number: DOI-BLM-OR134-2012-DNA-0035

Proposed Action Title: Split Rock Bench Installation

Location of Proposed Action: BLM Split Rock recreation site, located 19 miles west of Oroville, along the Oroville-Loomis highway (T39N, R26E, S18, Lots 7 & 8), in north-central Washington.

Description of Proposed Action: Install one concrete bench at east edge of Split Rock parking area, in gravel picnic area. The bench is approximately 6ft long x 2 ft wide, similar in appearance to the nearby picnic tables (concrete top, aggregate legs). Two holes would be dug, approximately 2 feet deep in the gravel fill. The bench would be installed, with concrete placed around the legs of the bench to stabilize it. Holes would be backfilled and gravel raked across the top, to ensure an undisturbed appearance. The bench would be installed in the gravel picnic area near the boat ramp, which was constructed in 2005. A concrete picnic table with shelter is approximately 10 feet to the west in the same picnic area.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan Name: Spokane Resource Management Plan
Date Approved/Amended: Approved 1987/Amended 1992

☒*Option 1 (conforms with LUP):* The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s): This proposed action is subject to the Spokane District Resource Management Plan (1985), its Record of Decision (ROD)(1987), and its RMP Plan Amendment (1992) and ROD (1992), specifically Chapter 2; General Management Objectives: 7: Manage public lands for increasing recreational uses and keep access routes open for a variety of recreational opportunities/experiences, including both motorized and nonmotorized recreation activities.

OR

☐*(Option 2: not explicitly provided for in the LUP)* The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (*objectives, terms, and conditions)*:

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document(s) or other related document(s) that cover the proposed action

Name and date of NEPA document(s):
Split Rock Recreation Site Improvements EA OR134EA-11, signed June 21, 2005

Name and date of other relevant document(s):
Spokane District Resource Management Plan (1985), its Record of Decision (ROD)(1987), and its RMP Plan Amendment (1992) and ROD(1992).

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?
Yes, the proposed action is similar to the proposed action alternative analyzed in the above EA.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?
Yes

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?
Yes

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?
Yes

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?
Yes

E. Persons/Agencies/Consulted (BLM Staff Consulted are listed on the coversheet attached to this document, or available at the BLM office identified in Section A, above).

Name	Title	Resource/Agency Represented
Dr. Robert Whitlam	State Archaeologist	Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation

F: Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

/s/ Linda Coates-Markle	November 5, 2012
(Signature of Responsible Official)	(Date)

Name: Linda Coates-Markle
Title: Wenatchee Field Manager

G. Contact Person
For additional information concerning this DNA, contact Holly Eagleston, 509-665-2100

Note: The signed Conclusion on this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.