

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior

Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: Eugene District BLM

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-OR-E060-2012-0012-DNA

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Channel Restoration Project 2012

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T. 15 S., R. 2 W., sec. 15., Log stream crossing of Crooked Creek and Road No. 15-2-22.2.

A. Description of Proposed Action

The proposed action is to remove fill material and logs from a stream crossing in the upper reach of Crooked Creek, rehabilitation of the stream channel, and road closure. Work would be accomplished with an excavator (track mounted backhoe) positioned on the existing road bed. Access is via Road No. 15-2-22.2, which is no longer available to vehicles due to down material and fill failure(s). The Land Use Designation is Riparian Reserve. Habitat is forested, dominated by second growth Douglas-fir. No machine travel in the stream is needed, and no trees would be felled to access the log fill site. Stream rehabilitation work includes: re-establish original channel depth and width, slope back channel side slopes, and seed and mulch with native materials for erosion control. Road work includes: construction of water bars, lead off ditches etc. and closure with a berm barricade. Project would be accomplished during summer of 2012 during the ODFW in-stream work period, and is expected to take one or two days.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: Eugene District Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan (RMP). Date Approved: June 1995 and amended in 2005.

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

The Eugene District Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan calls for designing and implementing watershed restoration projects in a manner that promotes long-term ecological integrity of native species, and attains Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives.

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

This action is covered in the Environmental assessment for Eugene District Aquatic and Riparian Restoration Activities Environmental Assessment No. DOI-BLM-OR-090-2009-0009-EA. Activities include the removal and replacement of existing road stream crossings (culverts and bridges) that restrict fish passage and flow with structures that allow for passage. This project would remove the barriers and restore the channel (no culverts would be installed).

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?

This action is specifically cited and analyzed in the Aquatic Restoration EA for projects like this within the Eugene District BLM. Activities include the removal of existing road stream crossings (USDI 2010).

- (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?

The Aquatic Restoration EA analyzed a reasonable number of alternatives, including no action that showed differences in the effects in each alternative. No unexpected changes to the existing environment or resource values have occurred that would trigger the initialization of new NEPA analysis here.

- (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?

The existing Aquatic Restoration EA analysis covers this project and no new information, circumstances or recent listings would alter the analysis that was conducted. There are no new circumstances or new information that would change the original analysis conducted in the Aquatic Restoration EA.

- (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?

The direct, indirect, and cumulative effects are specifically addressed in the Aquatic Restoration EA. "Several of the proposed actions, including instream restoration, culvert and bridge projects, road decommissioning, stream bank restoration, and head-cut stabilization, require the operation of heavy equipment in the riparian area and stream channel. These activities would increase the amount of fine sediment delivered to stream channels and would increase turbidity, though the effects would be short-term and localized in nature" (USDI, 2010 pg 42).

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

The BLM completed the NEPA process for the Aquatic Restoration EA and responded to all comments and questions associated with the EA. Copies of the Aquatic Restoration EA and preliminary FONSI were mailed to interested individuals on the Eugene District mailing list.

E. Persons/Agencies /BLM Staff Consulted

Name Title/ Resource/Agency Represented:

Richard Hardt	NEPA Coordinator	Eugene District
Steve Liebhardt	Fisheries Biologist	Upper Willamette RA
Cheshire Mayrsohn	Botanist	UW RA
Rudy Wiedenbeck	Soil Scientist	UW RA
Chris Langdon	Wildlife Biologist	UW RA
Todd Bush	Hydrologist	UW RA

The list above refers to resource specialists participating in the preparation of this DNA document.

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.

Signature of Project Lead Date: 8/31/2012

/s/ Susan Wiedenbeck

Signature of NEPA Coordinator Date: 8/31/2012

/s/ Richard Hardt

Signature of the Responsible Official: Date: 9/12/2012

/s/ Mark Stephen (Acting

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.