



Categorical Exclusion Form

Project: Kayak/Canoe Dock on Diablo Lake at the Haul Road

PEPC Project Number: 64517

Description of Action (Project Description):

This project would attach a 16' by 30' kayak dock to the existing ferry dock on the far, east side of Diablo Lake at the base of the Ross Haul Road.

As part of the response to the 2010 rockslide on Diablo Lake, SCL constructed two new docks on the far, east side of the lake for recreational and administrative use; however, neither is particularly accessible for paddlecraft, particularly kayakers, who are seeking to access Ross Lake from Diablo Lake. The NPS administrative dock is low to the water and attached to the shoreline at the base of a set of stairs which are set at a (close to) 90 degree angle from the dock. The recreational dock, located down a straight gangway from the shoreline, is really intended for the Ross Resort Ferry Boat and SCL administrative uses and is much higher off the water, making it much more difficult for paddlers to load and unload their craft.

This project seeks to fix this problem by attaching an ADA compliant floating dock, designed specifically for kayaks and canoes, to the ferry dock on the upstream side. This dock, made by AccuDock, would be approximately 16' by 30' and would include two slips in order to accommodate both canoes and kayaks (see attached drawing). The dock would also include two handrails that span the slips which will help the users enter and exit their boats. The entire dock would be comprised of framed floats made of white hand welded High Density Polyethylene (HDPE) sheet plastic and completely encapsulated expanded polystyrene (EPS) foam, with a marine grade aluminum frame. The railings themselves would also be aluminum (see attached floating dock specifications). The whole unit would attach to the existing ferry dock; no anchoring system is needed. This specialized dock provides a safe stable platform that is close to the water's surface, making launch and recovery easier and safer.

Seattle City Light would be funding this project as mitigation for their work in response to the 2010 rockslide and can complete the installation. The dock could be removed during the winter but would likely remain in place to reduce burden on maintenance staff. It would only be removed if thought to incur damage over the winter months from weather conditions and administrative use at the site.

Project Locations:

Location

County:	Whatcom	State:	WA
Geo. Marker:	48.723492 (GIS Point)	Other:	-121.072181

Mitigation(s):

- This dock shall include no treated wood (all HDPE plastic and aluminum); shall attach to the existing ferry dock with no in water anchoring system; and shall not be located over limnetic zone of lake (cannot shade littoral vegetation).

CE Citation: C.18 Construction of minor structures, including small improved parking lots, in previously disturbed or developed areas.


Explanation:

This dock will be attached to an existing dock within a developed area, within the hydroelectric zone of Ross Lake National Recreation Area. No modifications to the shoreline are anticipated. Rather, this project is intended to improve the accessibility of the developed area for visitors - particularly paddlecraft - and its addition is compatible with the existing facilities in place.

Decision: I find that the action fits within the categorical exclusion above. Therefore, I am categorically excluding the described project from further NEPA analysis. No extraordinary circumstances apply.

Signature

Superintendent:

 **Date:** 8/1/16
Karen F. Taylor-Goodrich

Extraordinary Circumstances:

If implemented, would the proposal...	Yes/No	Notes
A. Have significant impacts on public health or safety?	No	
B. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation, or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas?	No	
C. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (NEPA section 102(2)(E))?	No	
D. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?	No	
E. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?	No	
F. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?	No	
G. Have significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, as determined by either the bureau or office?	No	
H. Have significant impacts on species listed or proposed to be listed on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species?	No	
I. Violate a federal, state, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?	No	
J. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EO 12898)?	No	
K. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (EO 130007)?	No	
L. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112)?	No	