Swiftwater Stream Crossing Upgrade Project

EA# OR-104-04-04

Decision Record

An Interdisciplinary (ID) Team of the Swiftwater Field Office, Roseburg District, Bureau of Land Management has analyzed the proposed **Swiftwater Stream Crossing Upgrade Project**. This analysis and the "Finding of No Significant Impact" (FONSI) were documented in Environmental Assessment (EA) No. OR-104-04-04. The thirty day public review and comment period was completed on February 12th, 2004. No comments were received.

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 replacement of stream crossing culverts at six sites within the Swiftwater Resource Area, located in the Elk Creek, Middle North Umpqua and Upper Calapooya fifth-field watersheds in Section 17, T.21S., R.4W.; Sections 15 and 27, T.22S., R.4W.; Section 3, T.25S., R.4W.; and Section 17, T.26S., R.2W.; W.M.

Decision

It is my decision to authorize the implementation of the Proposed Action as outlined above and described in EA #OR-104-04-04. The EA did not identify any impacts of the Proposed Action that would be beyond those identified in the EIS. These projects will be accomplished through contracts offered for bid and accomplished during the summer construction seasons of 2004 through 2005.

Decision Rationale

The Proposed Action Alternative meets the objectives for lands in the Matrix and Riparian Reserve Land Use Allocations and follows the 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 EA describes two alternatives: a "No Action" alternative and a "Proposed Action" alternative. 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 objective of reducing potential sedimentation, improving fish passage and opening additional stream habitat to Pacific salmonids.

Cultural clearances have been completed according to protocol. No consultation was required.

Consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for Threatened and Endangered wildlife species is covered under the *Formal Consultation and Written Concurrence on FY 2003-2008 Management Activities (Ref. # 1-15-03-F-160)* (Feb. 21, 2003) which concluded (pg. 29) that the project would ". . . not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the spotted owl, murrelet and bald eagle, and are not likely to adversely modify spotted owl or murrelet critical habitat . . .".

Consultation with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration – fisheries for Threatened and Endangered aquatic species is covered under the *Programmatic Biological and Conference Opinion* (October 18, 2002) which concluded (pg. 12) that the project ". . . is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of . . . OC coho salmon, or OC steelhead". ." In addition, the proposed activities were analyzed for, and determined to not adversely affect Essential Fisheries Habitat (EFH).

This decision is based on the fact that the Proposed Action Alternative implements the Management Actions/Direction as stated in the RMP. The project design criteria as stated in the EA would protect the existing transportation network by reducing the risk of culvert failure (RMP, pg. 137), reduce barrier to movement and dispersal of anadromous and resident fish (RMP pg. 40), and reduce the risk of sediment input from culvert failure into the stream system (RMP pg. 19). This decision recognizes that impacts will occur to these resources, however, the impacts to resource values would not exceed those identified in the Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/EIS).

Comments were solicited from affected tribal governments, affected State and local government agencies and certain members of the public. No comments were received.

Compliance and Monitoring

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

Protest and Appeal Procedures

Protests shall be filed with the authorized officer (Jay K. Carlson) and shall contain a written statement of reasons for protesting the decision. Protests received more than 15 days after the publication of the Notice of Decision are not timely filed and shall not be considered. Upon timely filing of a protest, the authorized officer shall reconsider the decision to be implemented in light of the statement of reasons for the protest and other pertinent information available to him. The authorized officer shall, at the conclusion of his review, serve his decision in writing to the protesting party. Upon denial of a protest the authorized officer may proceed with the implementation of the decision.

For further information, contact Jay K. Carlson, Field Manager, Swiftwater Field Office, Roseburg District, Bureau of Land Management, 777 NW Garden Valley Blvd; Roseburg, OR. 97470, 541 440-4931.

Jay K. Carlson, Field Manager
Swiftwater Field Office

2/12/04
Date