

## C: Record of Decision

### UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

### RECORD OF DECISION

#### GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

#### LASSEN VOLCANIC NATIONAL PARK SHASTA, TEHAMA, PLUMAS AND LASSEN COUNTIES, CALIFORNIA

#### INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to section 102 (2) (C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, Public Law 91-190 (as amended), and the regulations promulgated by the Council on Environmental Quality at 40 CFR 1505.2, the Department of the Interior, National Park Service, has prepared the following "Record of Decision" on the *Final Environmental Impact Statement for the General Management Plan* for Lassen Volcanic National Park.

This "Record of Decision" is a concise statement of the decisions made, the alternatives considered, the basis for the decision, and the mitigating measures developed to avoid or minimize environmental impacts.

#### DECISION

The National Park Service will adopt a general management plan for Lassen Volcanic National Park as outlined in the proposed action (Alternative C: Resource Protection and Enhanced Visitor Experience) contained in the General Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement dated August, 2001. The selected action is described below.

#### SELECTED ACTION

**Plan Vision** - Lassen Volcanic National Park is a model for ecosystem management, wilderness preservation, and cultural resource protection for the benefit of present and future generations.

Resource conditions are known and basic trends of natural systems have been assessed. Scientifically sound mechanisms are in place to ensure that natural systems and processes are perpetuated. Cultural resources and their significance are documented and appropriate preservation standards are applied. All stakeholders play an active stewardship role.

A diversity of visitors are provided year-around opportunities for education, enjoyment, and understanding which inspire appreciation of resource values and dedication to stewardship. Wilderness visitors experience a landscape largely devoid of human impacts.

**Plan Concept** - The plan preserves, protects, and restores natural and cultural resources and wilderness conditions. Designated wilderness would be increased by approximately 25,000 acres. Gathering of baseline data on natural and cultural resources would be accelerated. This information is essential for completion of scientific studies to guide resource preservation and restoration activities for such needs as exotic species control and habitat restoration for threatened and endangered species. Tested monitoring methods would be applied. Park staff would increase efforts to work with the Forest Service and other regional land managers toward ecosystem management. Visitor activity would be closely monitored and managed to prevent resource damage.

The plan would provide visitors with high quality park experiences throughout the calendar year. Visitor safety and protection would be increased. Interpretive activities would provide basic orientation/information and encourage individual stewardship and resource protection. Facility improvements would be undertaken to achieve resource protection and improved management efficiency.

Budget increases for staff would be targeted to resource management staff, but would also include ranger activities, interpretation, and maintenance to support functions related to resource management and quality visitor experience. Staff and funding increases would result in:

- More effective control of exotic plant and animal species, including non-native fish species in lakes and streams;
- Analysis of the feasibility of reintroduction of selected extirpated species such as the wolverine and fisher in cooperation and consultation with adjacent land managers such as the Forest Service;
- Increased use of prescribed fire to restore natural conditions and reduce fuel loads;
- Inventory and monitoring of natural resources, especially those identified as vital signs for ecosystem health;
- Management of all cultural resources to achieve the servicewide standard;
- Better maintenance of trails and service roads to prevent resource damage;
- Stimulation of increased visitor stewardship through interpretive and resource education programs;

Greatly improved visitor service at the southwest entrance;

Increased ecosystem management efforts;

Increased “partnering” efforts with local communities, other government agencies, American Indian communities, and private organizations;

Winterization of facilities to allow day use in winter and shoulder seasons;

Increased interpretive staffing to provide for ranger-led programs in key visitor locations, including remote sites such as Butte Lake, Juniper Lake and Warner Valley;

Improved campfire and amphitheater facilities to support interpretive programs;

Improved pullouts on the main road to provide interpretive and scenic view opportunities;

Improved visitor information including radio broadcasts and written guides;

Enhanced winter access and visitor services at the northwest entrance (i.e. concessions, interpretive programs);

Improved facilities for environmental education.

### **OTHER ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

The environmental impact statement evaluated four alternatives for the management and use of Lassen Volcanic National Park over the next 15 years.

**Alternative A: No Action** - assumes that physical facilities would remain largely unchanged and that staffing and operational funding would remain constant over the planning period.

**Alternative B: Resource Preservation and Basic Visitor Service** - provides a program for preserving, and where necessary, restoring significant park resources. It includes significant staffing and funding increases for the park’s resource management functions, restores key elements of the park’s infrastructure, provides for restoration of several specific sites with natural system conflicts, establishes a standards-based management zoning system, and proposes designation of approximately 25,000 acres as part of the National Wilderness System. The plan also includes program increases and visitor facility improvements to provide for quality basic visitor service.

**Alternative C: Resource Protection and Enhanced Visitor Experience** - is described above as the Selected Action.

**Alternative D: Resource Protection and Expanded Visitor Opportunities** - includes all of the features of Alternative C and in addition, provides for expansion of family and

group campgrounds at several locations. It also expands winter access at the north entrance by plowing the park road an additional nine miles to the Devastated Area, and keeping one loop of the campground open for winter camping.

### **BASIS FOR DECISION**

The proposed plan is the selected action because it provides increased protection for the park's significant natural, cultural, and wilderness resources and improves visitor experience while increasing management efficiency and avoiding significant environmental impacts.

**Natural, Cultural, and Wilderness Resource Protection** - Resource protection would be enhanced by increasing staff and funding for inventory, maintenance, and physical protection of resources, by removal of facilities from wetlands and other areas of significant environmental value, and by the use of interpretation to stimulate greater environmental stewardship among visitors and others in local communities through educational outreach efforts.

**Visitor Experience Enhancement** - Visitor experience would be enhanced by remediating existing health and safety deficiencies, by increasing interpretive and educational opportunities, and by expanding the season of use in several areas of the park through winterization of facilities.

**Management Efficiency Enhancement** - Operational efficiency would be increased by upgrading management facilities to allow for increased communication and staff productivity, modernizing the park's utility infrastructure, and by relocating ranger staff from the headquarters area to the southwest entrance proximate to the workload.

**Avoidance of Adverse Environmental Impacts** - No significant adverse environmental impacts would be expected as a result of the proposal. Major beneficial impacts would accrue in the area of natural and cultural resource protection and visitor experience. Minor adverse impacts would result to soils and vegetation from the limited proposed development projects.

### **FINDINGS ON IMPAIRMENT OF PARK RESOURCES AND VALUES**

The Act of August 25, 1916, often referred to as the National Park Service Organic Act, 16 USC2, created the National Park Service and assigned to it responsibility for administering the parks and monuments under its jurisdiction "...by such means and measures as conform to the fundamental purpose of the said parks, monuments, and reservations, which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations"

National Park Service' *Management Policies 2001* highlights the necessity of avoiding "impairment" as a legally binding requirement and provides guidelines and criteria for ensuring that management decisions do not result in impairment.

In determining whether impairment may occur, park managers consider the duration, severity, and magnitude of impacts; the resources and values affected; and direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the action. According to National Park Service policy, "An impact would be more likely to constitute an impairment to the extent that it affects a resource or value whose conservation is: a) Necessary to fulfill specific purposes identified in the establishing legislation or proclamation of the park; b) Key to the natural or cultural integrity of the park or to opportunities for enjoyment of the park; or c) Identified as a goal in the park's general management plan or other relevant National Park Service planning documents."

This policy does not prohibit impacts to park resources and values. The National Park Service has the discretion to allow impacts to park resources and values when necessary and appropriate to fulfill the purposes of a park, so long as the impacts do not constitute impairment. Moreover, an impact is less likely to constitute impairment if it is an unavoidable result of an action necessary to preserve or restore the integrity of park resources or values.

Human activity and past development have resulted in the ongoing disruption of natural systems and processes at some locations in Lassen Volcanic National Park for generations. The No Action Alternative would result in future unplanned and uncoordinated actions that are merely reactive to immediate concerns. Furthermore, these actions would likely be responsive to immediate, short-term, adverse impacts that demand attention, but may result in long term impairment to park values and resources.

The actions comprising the proposed general management plan will protect and enhance the natural and cultural resources of Lassen Volcanic National Park and provide opportunities for high-quality, resource-based year-around visitor experiences in a comprehensive, integrated manner that takes into account the interplay between resource protection and visitor use. Actions implemented under the proposed plan that will cause overall negligible adverse impacts, minor adverse impacts, short term impacts, and beneficial impacts to park resources and values, as described in the Lassen Volcanic National Park General Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement, will not constitute impairment. This is because these impacts have limited severity and/or duration and will not result in appreciable irreversible commitments of resources. Beneficial effects identified in the Final EIS include effects related to restoring and protecting park resources and values.

In conclusion, the National Park Service has determined that implementation of the proposed general management plan will not constitute an impairment of Lassen Volcanic National Park's resources and values. This conclusion is based on a thorough analysis of the environmental impacts described in the Final Lassen Volcanic National Park General

Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement, the public comments received, relevant scientific studies, and the professional judgment of the decision-maker guided by the direction in Director's Order 55. While the plan has some minor negative impacts, these adverse impacts are the result of actions taken to preserve and restore other park resources and values. Overall, the plan results in major benefits to park resources and values, facilitates their enjoyment by the public, and does not result in their impairment.

### **ENVIRONMENTALLY PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE**

Environmentally preferable is defined as "the alternative that will promote the national environmental policy as expressed in the National Environmental Policy Act's Section 101. Ordinarily, this means the alternative that causes the least damage to the biological and physical environment; it also means the alternative which best protects, preserves, and enhances historic, cultural, and natural resources" (Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning Council on Environmental Quality's National Environmental Policy Act Regulations, 1981).

The goals characterizing the environmentally preferable condition are described in Section 101 of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). NEPA Section 101 states that "...it is the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government to ... (1) fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations; (2) assure for all Americans safe, healthful, productive, and aesthetically and culturally pleasing surroundings; (3) attain the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, risk to health or safety, or other undesirable and unintended consequences; (4) preserve important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage, and maintain, wherever possible, an environment which supports diversity, and variety of individual choice; (5) achieve a balance between population and resource use which will permit high standards of living and a wide sharing of life's amenities; and (6) enhance the quality of renewable resources and approach the maximum attainable recycling of depletable resources."

Selection of the environmentally preferred alternative for the Lassen Volcanic National Park General Management Plan is based on these national environmental policy goals.

**Alternative A: No Action** - This alternative continues the current management direction with no significant or comprehensive changes taking place in the management of the park. Although Alternative A would have the least physical changes to park resources, it would not achieve the same level of environmental protection and restoration for park resources as would occur under the various action alternatives. In having lesser protection and restoration of park resources, including highly valued natural, cultural, and wilderness resources, Alternative A would not fully achieve provisions 1, 3, 4, and 5 of Section 101 of NEPA. Compared to the action alternatives, the No Action alternative would be least effective in attaining goal 3 of NEPA, as described in Section 101, in that it would have the narrowest range of beneficial uses that would occur without degradation of natural and cultural resources in the park and without exposure to risks to health and safety. Because of existing impacts that are not remedied and that relate to

provisions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 of Section 101 (as discussed above), these provisions would not be realized by Alternative A, the No Action Alternative.

**Alternative B: Resource Preservation and Basic Visitor Service** - This alternative would realize each of the provisions of the national environmental policy goals stated in NEPA Section 101. Alternative B would protect and enhance the park's natural, cultural, and wilderness resources. These actions would further goals 3, 4, and 5 of NEPA Section 101 by attaining a wide range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation, and by preserving important resources and maintaining a variety of individual choice for visitors to the park.

The features of Alternative B will achieve each of the NEPA goals, but the limited provisions for enrichment of visitor experience through interpretation and education will limit the indirect benefits which could be realized from the stimulation of increased environmental stewardship.

**Alternative C: Resource Protection and Enhanced Visitor Experience** - Overall, the benefit and effect of the alternative's environmental restoration activities would be similar to those described under Alternative B. However, this alternative would be more effective than Alternative B in realizing the provisions of the national environmental policy goals in Section 101 of NEPA. Visitor services in this alternative would be designed to encourage environmental awareness and stewardship with benefits both within and outside Lassen Volcanic National Park. The additional visitor facility improvements included in this alternative would occur in already developed areas, would be intended primarily to winterize facilities so as to allow a longer season of use, and would not result in significant environmental impacts.

**Alternative D: Resource Protection and Expanded Visitor Opportunities** - Overall, this alternative would be similar to Alternative C in realizing the provisions of the national environmental policy goals in Section 101 of NEPA. However, visitor facility expansion in several locations aimed at increasing visitor capacities would have minor incremental adverse impacts on vegetation, soils, and wildlife as compared to Alternatives B and C.

**Summary** - The National Park Service has determined that the environmentally preferred alternative is Alternative C. While other alternatives may achieve similar levels of protection for certain cultural resources, natural resources, wilderness resources and/or visitor experience, Alternative C, in aggregate, best achieves the six conditions prescribed under Section 101 of NEPA. While many of the actions in other alternatives may be similar to Alternative C in their effect and consequence, Alternative C provides a high level of protection of natural and cultural resources while concurrently attaining the widest range of beneficial uses of the environment without degradation; maintains an environment that supports diversity and variety of individual choice; and integrates resource protection with opportunities for an appropriate range of visitor uses.

## MEASURES TO MINIMIZE ENVIRONMENTAL HARM

The proposed general management plan has relatively limited potential for environmental harm because much of the plan is dedicated to environmental rehabilitation projects such as the removal of facilities from wetland locations. In addition, all of the physical improvements and/or additions will occur in areas that are already disturbed. For example, the largest single construction project, the southwest entrance visitor service facility, will be located in an area already occupied by structures and parking lots, and the finished product will be a significant esthetic improvement over the present situation and will provide code-compliant, sustainable, maintainable, and accessible facilities.

All practical means to avoid or minimize environmental harm associated with included plan features have been included in the proposed action. Any development projects, water management projects, or vegetation management projects would be preceded by archeological surveys, surveys for threatened and endangered plant species, and consideration of cultural landscape implications.

Because NPS general management plans primarily provide a vision of the future, they do not include a great deal of detail on how to achieve that vision. A number of action plans and development designs will be prepared subsequently to implement this GMP and provide more specific guidance on how to achieve the vision. Plans will be completed for various park programs, e.g. natural and cultural resource management, interpretation, land protection, and fire management. Site plans and designs will be completed for proposed development and/or proposed relocation of existing development. All of these plans will reflect the management direction and the vision articulated in the approved GMP, and in most cases, these implementation plans and designs will include additional public review and environmental compliance at a more detailed level. The impacts of all construction projects and various other park programs/projects to be implemented under the approved general management plan (e.g., natural resource management, interpretation, land protection, fire management, etc.), will also be considered in subsequent implementing plans in order to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the implementing regulations set forth at 36 CFR Part 800.

## PUBLIC AND INTERAGENCY INVOLVEMENT

### REVIEW OF DRAFT GMP/EIS

**Procedures** - Availability of the draft GMP/EIS was announced August 25, 2000 in the *Federal Register* in the Environmental Protection Agency's routine weekly nationwide listing of environmental documents. In addition, the Park Service's notice of availability was published in the *Federal Register* on August 18, 2000. Both notices set October 31, 2000 as the deadline for submission of comments to the park superintendent.

News releases regarding the plan and its availability were widely distributed to local and regional media.



Copies of the draft GMP/EIS were sent to persons attending the scoping meetings, offering written comments during the scoping period, or requesting to be kept informed of the planning project. In addition, agencies and organizations known to have an interest in future management decisions for Lassen Volcanic National Park were sent copies. The park mailed out a total of 673 copies of the draft GMP/EIS.

Seven public workshops were held in communities near the park in late August and early September to answer questions about the document. No oral comments were recorded or transcribed at these workshops; participants wishing to have comments included in the record were asked to provide them in writing. The park superintendent contacted all four county Boards of Supervisors about the draft and gave a presentation to the Plumas County Board of Supervisors.

A meeting was also held during the comment period with the senior management team of Lassen National Forest to discuss the draft document and range of alternatives.

**Substance of Review Comments** - A total of 189 letters of comment were received by the park during the comment period. These letters ranged from several page analyses of the draft document to postcards highlighting specific issues or preferences. Included were 31 individual letters from members of a sixth-grade class who visited the park and prepared suggestions as part of a class project.

Of those commenters explicitly expressing support for one of the alternatives, Alternative C received the most approval, with a total of 59 affirmative responses. Most of the letters supporting Alternative C noted particular support for wilderness expansion, reintroduction of extirpated species, and restoration of natural fire. Alternative D was next, with a total of 9 letters indicating it as their choice. Alternatives A and B were each selected three times.

A total of 34 comment letters expressed opposition to the proposal for relocation of the Juniper Lake campground. Many of the letters were from long-time users of the area who find the campground to be a particularly appealing setting and question the need for relocation. Several of the letters indicated dissatisfaction with the National Park Service rationale and with the scientific basis for the proposal.

The proposal for designation of an additional 25,000 acres of the park as wilderness was endorsed in 56 comment letters. A number of the letters urged that wilderness protection be made the park's first priority and specified several management actions to be carried out to achieve that end. However, a total of 8 letters opposed the designation of additional land as wilderness, citing concerns about limiting options for future development and exclusion of visitors not physically able to access the wilderness.

Many letters indicated support for increasing winter opportunities but expressed concerns about further plowing the road during the winter season because of impacts on wilderness character and on wildlife.

One commenter suggested inclusion of a new alternative featuring the development of a lodge in the Manzanita Lake area. However, such a development would be contrary to established National Park Service management policy, which calls for minimizing in-park commercial facilities when out-of-park opportunities are or can be readily made available. This is the case at Lassen Volcanic National Park, with reasonably close-by facilities in Mineral and other nearby communities.

## REVIEW OF FINAL GMP/EIS

**Procedures** - Availability of the final GMP/EIS was announced November 9, 2001 in the *Federal Register* in the Environmental Protection Agency's weekly nationwide listing of environmental documents. In addition, the Park Service's notice of availability was published in the *Federal Register* on December 7, 2001

News releases regarding the plan and its availability were widely distributed to local and regional media.

Copies of the final GMP/EIS were sent to all persons offering comments on the draft GMP/EIS or requesting to be kept informed of the planning project. In addition, agencies and organizations known to have an interest in future management decisions for Lassen Volcanic National Park were sent copies.

**Substance of Responses** - Only one respondent commented on the final General Management Plan, expressing disagreement with proposed additions to park wilderness, proposals for park infrastructure improvements, and the park's stated intention to evaluate the impact of aircraft overflights on park values and resources. No new issues were raised, no significant environmental impacts were identified, and no deficiencies were identified in the EIS' evaluation of environmental impacts.

## CONCLUSION

The above factors and considerations justify selection of the alternative identified as the proposed action in the final environmental impact statement.

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

  
John J. Reynolds  
Regional Director, Pacific West Region

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

2.25.02

## D: List of Classified Structures (LCS)

	<b>LCS ID</b>	<b>Preferred Structure Name</b>	<b>Structure Number</b>	<b>Ultimate Structure Treatment</b>
1.	005459	Park Headquarters Building	B1	Preservation (PP)
2.	005460	Service Station	B21	Preservation (PP)
3.	005461	Park Naturalist's Residence	R41	Stabilization (ST)
4.	005462	Mae Loomis Memorial Museum	B43	Rehabilitation (RH)
5.	005464	Ranger Residence	R49	Preservation (PP)
6.	005465	Park Entrance Station	B50	Preservation (PP)
7.	005466	Twin Lakes Patrol Cabin	B53	No Treatment Documented (NO)
8.	005467	Horseshoe Lake Ranger Station	R56	Preservation (PP)
9.	005468	Mount Harkness Fire Lookout	B57	Preservation (PP)
10.	005469	Warner Valley Ranger Station	R58	Preservation (PP)
11.	005470	Loomis Seismograph Station	B178	Rehabilitation (RH)
12.	005473	Mount Harkness Pit Toilet	B353	No Treatment Documented (NO)
13.	005474	Sunflower Flume and Canal	HS2	No Treatment Documented (NO)
14.	014012	Prospect Peak Fire Lookout	HS10	Preservation (PP)
15.	014030	Summit Lake Ranger Station	B37	Preservation (PP)
16.	021124	Split Rail Fence	HS4	No Treatment Documented (NO)
17.	021125	Superintendent's Residence	B2	Preservation (PP)
18.	021126	Superintendent's Garage	B3	Preservation (PP)
19.	021127	Residence 4	R4	Preservation (PP)
20.	021128	Garage for Residence 4	B5	Preservation (PP)
21.	021129	Residence 6	R6	Preservation (PP)
22.	021130	Garage for Residence 6	B7	Preservation (PP)
23.	021131	Residence 8	B8	Preservation (PP)
24.	021132	Garage for Residences 8 and 10	B9	Preservation (PP)
25.	021133	Residence 10	R10	Preservation (PP)
26.	021134	Residence 11	R11	Preservation (PP)
27.	021135	Garage for Residence 11	B12	Preservation (PP)
28.	021136	Residence 13	R13	Preservation (PP)
29.	021137	Dormitory	R14	Preservation (PP)
30.	021138	Residence 16	R16	Preservation (PP)

31.	021139	Residence 17	R17	Preservation (PP)
32.	021140	Wash House	B19	Preservation (PP)
33.	021141	Fire Cache	B20	Preservation (PP)
34.	021142	Warehouse & Maintenance Office	B22	Preservation (PP)
35.	021143	Machine Shop	B23	Preservation (PP)
36.	021144	Equipment and Storage Shed	B24	Preservation (PP)
37.	021145	Garage and Storage Building	B25	Preservation (PP)
38.	021146	Roads and Trails Building	B26	Preservation (PP)
39.	021147	Carpenter Shop	B27	Preservation (PP)
40.	021148	Electrical Shop	B28	Preservation (PP)
41.	021149	Storage Barn	B30	Preservation (PP)
42.	056776	Seismograph Building at Headquarters	B31	Preservation (PP)
43.	056777	Raker Memorial Gateway	LF1	No Treatment Documented (NO)
44.	056778	Raker Peak Sign	LF2	No Treatment Documented (NO)
45.	056779	Diamond Peak Sign	LF3	No Treatment Documented (NO)
46.	056780	Manzanita Lake Sign	LF4	No Treatment Documented (NO)
47.	056781	Hat Lake Sign	LF5	No Treatment Documented (NO)
48.	056782	Manzanita Lake Hanging Sign	LF6	No Treatment Documented (NO)
49.	056783	Hat Creek Culvert-Bridge	LF7	No Treatment Documented (NO)
50.	056784	Lost Creek Culvert-Bridge	LF8	No Treatment Documented (NO)
51.	056785	National Park Service Route 1 (State Route 89)	LF9	No Treatment Documented (NO)
52.	056786	National Park Service Route 1 Culverts	LF10	No Treatment Documented (NO)
53.	056787	National Park Service Route 1 Retaining Walls	LF11	No Treatment Documented (NO)
54.	056788	Northwest Entrance Pylon	LF12	No Treatment Documented (NO)
55.	056789	Loomis House	B39	Rehabilitation (RH)
56.	056790	Nobles Emigrant Trail	HS1	No Treatment Documented (NO)
57.	056791	Warner Valley Ranger Station Barn and Corral	B60	Preservation (PP)
58.	056792	Warner Valley Ranger Station Garage	B59	Preservation (PP)
59.	056793	Generator Plant	B29	Preservation (PP)
60.	056794	Maintenance Compound East Retaining Wall	LF13	No Treatment Documented (NO)

61.	056795	Maintenance Area Retaining Wall at Northern Boundary	LF14	No Treatment Documented (NO)
62.	056796	Old Viola Road	LF15	No Treatment Documented (NO)
63.	056797	Old Viola Road Drainage Ditches and Culverts	LF16	No Treatment Documented (NO)
64.	056798	Mineral Residential Road	LF17	No Treatment Documented (NO)
65.	056799	Residential Road Culverts & Drainage Ditches	LF18	No Treatment Documented (NO)
66.	056800	Residential Area Spur Road	LF19	No Treatment Documented (NO)
67.	056801	Residential Area Retaining Walls	LF20	No Treatment Documented (NO)
68.	056802	Utility Area	LF21	No Treatment Documented (NO)
69.	056803	Mary Westrope Grave Marker	MKR1	No Treatment Documented (NO)
70.	056804	Sarah Cunningham Grave Marker	MKR2	No Treatment Documented (NO)
71.	056805	Mount Harkness Cistern	XX	No Treatment Documented (NO)
72.	056806	Naturalist's Garage	B42	No Treatment Documented (NO)
73.	056807	Drakesbad Lodge	267	Preservation (PP)
74.	056808	Drakesbad Lodge Dining Hall	268	Preservation (PP)
75.	056809	Drakesbad Cold House	3	Preservation (PP)
76.	056810	Drakesbad Guest Cabin #9	272	Preservation (PP)
77.	056811	Drakesbad Guest Cabin #10	273	Preservation (PP)
78.	056812	Drakesbad Guest Cabin #11	274	Preservation (PP)
79.	056813	Drakesbad Guest Cabin #12	275	Preservation (PP)
80.	056814	Drakesbad Storage Building	281	Preservation (PP)
81.	056815	Water Fountain at Administration Building	LF22	No Treatment Documented (NO)
82.	056816	Administration Building Flagpole	LF23	No Treatment Documented (NO)
83.	056817	Sifford Memorial	MKR3	No Treatment Documented (NO)
84.	056818	Loomis House Retaining Wall	LF24	No Treatment Documented (NO)





## Planning Team and Consultants

### Planning Team

Marilyn H. Parris, Superintendent, Lassen Volcanic National Park (LVNP)

Karen Haner, Chief, Interpretation and Cultural Resources Management, LVNP

Dan Jones, Chief, Maintenance, LVNP

Louise Johnson, Chief, Natural Resources Management, LVNP

Karen Stoll, Chief Administration, LVNP

John Roth, Chief Ranger, LVNP

Meredith Kaplan, Landscape Architect/Planner, Pacific Great Basin Support Office (PGSO)

Lynne Nakata, Interpretive Specialist, PGSO

Dan Olson, Planner, PGSO

### Consultants

Roger Kelly, Archeologist/Ethnographer, PGSO

Alan Schmierer, Environmental Specialist, PGSO

Ann King Smith, Archeologist, Redwood National Park

*The National Park Service cares for the special places saved by the American people so that all may experience our heritage.*

*Experience Your America*



*As the nation's principal conservation agency, the Department of the Interior has responsibility for most of our nationally owned public lands and natural resources. This includes fostering sound use of our land and water resources; protecting our fish, wildlife, and biological diversity; preserving the environmental and cultural values of our national parks and historical places; and providing for the enjoyment of life through outdoor recreation. The department assesses our energy and mineral resources and works to ensure that their development is in the best interests of all our people by encouraging stewardship and citizen participation in their care. The department also has a major responsibility for American Indian reservation communities and for people who live in island territories under U.S. administration.*