



# United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

COOS BAY DISTRICT OFFICE

1300 AIRPORT LANE, NORTH BEND, OR 97459

Web Address: <http://www.blm.gov/or/districts/coosbay> E-mail: [OR\\_CoosBay\\_Mail@blm.gov](mailto:OR_CoosBay_Mail@blm.gov)

Telephone: (541) 756-0100 Toll Free: (888) 809-0839 Fax: (541) 751-4303



## **In Reply Refer To:**

1792/8011 (ORC040)

DOI-BLM-OR-C040-2010-0003-EA

New River Education Facility

*June 29, 2010*

Dear Citizen:

We have completed the New River Education Facility Environmental Assessment (DOI-BLM-OR-C040-2010-0003-EA) and have prepared a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). These documents include analysis of the potential impacts of constructing a yurt for the purposes of environmental education and interpretation at the New River Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC). The project is designed to implement management objectives and direction of the 1995 Coos Bay District Resource Management Plan.

The environmental assessment contains the analysis of the effects of a no-action alternative and a proposed action alternative. The proposed action is to construct a semi-permanent yurt at the Storm Ranch site of the ACEC, across from the Ellen Warring building.

You are encouraged to read the EA and comment on the appropriateness of the FONSI prior to the end of the 15-day comment period, July 14, 2010. This EA is located on our BLM web site at <http://www.blm.gov/or/districts/coosbay/plans/index.php>. A Decision Document will be published prior to implementing project activities.

Comments, including names and street addresses of respondents, will be made available for public review at the address above during regular business hours (8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.), Monday through Friday, except holidays, and may be published as part of the EA document or other related documents. Individual respondents may request confidentiality. If you wish to withhold your name or street address from public review or from disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act, you must state this prominently in the beginning of your written comment. Such requests will be honored to the extent allowed by law. All submissions from organizations or businesses, and from individuals identifying themselves as representatives or officials of organizations or businesses, will be made available for public inspection in their entirety.

Questions should be directed to Aimee Hoefs at (541)751-0100. Written comments on the appropriateness of the FONSI may be sent to Coos Bay District BLM, 1300 Airport Lane, North Bend, OR 97459-2000 Attn: Aimee Hoefs or e-mail to [OR\\_CoosBay\\_Mail@blm.gov](mailto:OR_CoosBay_Mail@blm.gov), RE: Yurt.

Sincerely,

*/s/ Kathy Westenskow*

Kathy Westenskow  
Myrtlewood Field Manager



# United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

COOS BAY DISTRICT OFFICE

1300 AIRPORT LANE, NORTH BEND, OR 97459

Web Address: <http://www.blm.gov/or/districts/coosbay> E-mail: [OR\\_CoosBay\\_Mail@blm.gov](mailto:OR_CoosBay_Mail@blm.gov)

Telephone: (541) 756-0100 Toll Free: (888) 809-0839 Fax: (541) 751-4303



## In Reply Refer To:

1792/8011 (ORC040)

DOI-BLM-OR-C040-2010-0003-EA

## FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

For the

New River Education Facility Environmental Assessment

DOI-BLM-OR-C040-2010-0003-EA

### I. Introduction

An Interdisciplinary Team has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) to analyze the effects of constructing a yurt at the Storm Ranch site in the New River Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC). This EA is hereby incorporated by reference. This document contained two alternatives: a no-action alternative and a proposed action alternative. The proposed action is to provide for environmental education and interpretation opportunities in the ACEC through construction of a semi-permanent yurt.

### II. Background

This EA was developed under the management direction of the 1995 Coos Bay District Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan (1995 ROD/RMP). The analysis supporting this decision tiers to the *Final Coos Bay District Proposed Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement* (UDSI 1994). The 1995 Record of Decision is also supported by, and in conformance with, the *Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on Management of Habitat for Late-Successional and Old Growth Forest Related Species Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl (Northwest Forest Plan)* (USDA and USDI 1994) and its *Record of Decision* (USDA and USDI 1994a) as supplemented and amended.

### III. Finding of No Significant Impact

In the EA, the effects analysis indicates that there would not be a significant impact on the quality of the human environment from the implementation of either alternative. This finding and conclusion is based on my consideration of the Council of Environmental Quality's (CEQ) criteria for significance (40 CFR 1508.27), both with regard to context and intensity of the impacts described in the EA.

#### Context

The proposed action would occur within the New River ACEC. The Management Plan describes the "intent is to provide a spectrum of environmental education and interpretive activities for visitors at New River" (p. 88).

There would be the development of less than one-tenth of an acre of sand-meadow habitat within the project area. Due to the small size of the project, and amount of similar habitat in the immediate vicinity of the proposal, the effects within the ACEC are negligible and keeping with what was identified under the 1995 Final New River ACEC Management Plan (USDI, 1995).

No more than two school buses a day per event (10-15 events total) would be scheduled for the ACEC during the school year. It is estimated that a maximum of 500 school children, with accompanying adults, would visit Storm Ranch annually if the proposed facility is constructed.

### **Intensity**

*Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse (40 CFR 1508.27 (b)(1))*

Any impacts, both beneficial and adverse, are not significant as they are consistent with the range and scope of those effects analyzed in the 1994 Final Coos Bay District Proposed Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement to which the EA is tiered.

*Public Health and Safety (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2))*

No aspect of the proposed action would have an effect on public health and safety.

*Unique characteristics of the geographic area (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3))*

There are no known parklands, prime or unique farmlands, wetlands, floodplains or Wild and Scenic Rivers that would be affected in the project area. As stated above, the loss of less than one-tenth of an acre of sand meadow habitat would not have any additional impacts to resources within the project area. There would be a long-term benefit in that the environmental education and interpretation programs would describe and promote the unique characteristics of the New River ACEC.

*Degree to which effects are likely to be highly controversial (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(4))*

The effects on the quality of the human environment of the proposed activity are not highly controversial. The general public is supportive of educational development.

*Degree to which effects are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(5))*

The possible effects of the proposed action on the quality of the human environment are not highly uncertain and do not involve unique or unknown risk.

*Consideration of whether the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant impacts (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(6))*

The proposed project does not establish a precedent for future actions or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant effects.

*Consideration of whether the action is related to other actions with cumulatively significant impacts (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(7))*

There are no cumulatively significant impacts identified by the environmental assessment.

*Scientific, cultural, or historical resources, including those listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8))*

The proposed activities would not affect districts, sites, highways, structures or objects listed in or potentially eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Nor would the activities cause a loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural or historical resources.

*Threatened or endangered species and their critical habitat (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9))*

There are no threatened or endangered species within the project area nor is there designated critical habitat.

*Any effects that threaten a violation of Federal, State, or local laws or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10))*

The proposed action would not violate Federal, State or local laws imposed for the protection of the environment. These include the Endangered Species Act and the Clean Water Act.

Analysis has also concluded that implementation of the proposed actions will not change the likelihood of and need for listing of any Special Status Species under the ESA as identified in BLM Manual 6840 and BLM OR/WA 6840 policy.

### **Conclusion**

Based on the information contained in the EA (DOI-BLM-OR-C040-2010-0003-EA), and all other information available to me I have determined that the proposed action would not have a significant impact on the human environment within the meaning of section 102(2) (c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and that an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. I have determined that the effects of the proposed activities would be in conformance with the 1995 *Record of Decision/Resource Management Plan* for the Coos Bay District.

*/s/ Kathy Westenskow*

*June 24, 2010*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kathy Westenskow  
Myrtlewood Field Manager

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

---

---

# New River Education Facility

---

---

---

---

**DOI-BLM-OR-C040-2010-0003-EA  
Coos Bay District  
Bureau of Land Management  
1300 Airport Lane  
North Bend Or. 97459**

---

---

## Chapter 1.0 Purpose and Need for Action

---

### Introduction

The New River Area of Environmental Critical Concern (ACEC) was designated in 1983. Many of the Objectives in the Management Plan for this ACEC center around providing interpretation and environmental education on the unique characteristics of New River.

In 2001, the Ellen Warring Learning Center was dedicated for the purpose of serving as a focal point for interpretation and educational activities for the public. The original intent of this facility was to “help meet program needs by providing space for a library and group gatherings, interpretive displays, storage of field equipment used by both naturalists and researchers...” (USDI 2004a).

### Need for the Project

The layout of the Ellen Warren Learning Center is now insufficient to provide both interpretive exhibits and conduct environmental education activities or site orientation. There is also insufficient storage space for all of the equipment necessary to conduct programs and provide multi-media presentations. The draft Interpretive Plan has identified the significant stories to be told about the ACEC as well as adult education components. The current facility is simply too small to handle all of the current and planned activities at the Storm Ranch area of the ACEC.

Estimates from BLM engineers determined that it would be too costly to renovate the Learning Center to make it better suited for BLM’s needs as identified in the management plan.

A low-cost, low-maintenance, new building structure would alleviate many of the issues described above.

### Project Objectives (Purpose)

Any action alternative to be given serious consideration as a reasonable alternative must meet the objectives provided in the ROD/RMP for projects to be implemented within the planning area. The RMP defers objectives to be followed from the site-specific management plan developed for the New River ACEC. This plan, updated in 2004, gives the following applicable Objectives:

- Use environmental education and interpretation as a tool to manage visitor impacts and to broaden the appreciation and stewardship of the New River ACEC (p.2) by:
  - Using recommendations from the draft Long Range Interpretive Plan when developing and conducting programs and interpretive materials (p.88)
  - Evaluate the effectiveness of environmental education programs and interpretive materials on a regular basis, and make modifications as necessary (p.89)
- Promote awareness and appreciation for New River’s many resource values, especially those significant to its ACEC designation (p.2)
  - Continue to host field trips for local elementary and middle schools at New River for students to learn about the unique natural environment of the area (p.89)

### Location

The project would be located within the New River Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) at the Storm Ranch location in T. 30 S., R. 15 W., section 11, Willamette Meridian.

## Decision Factors

In choosing the Alternative that best meets the Purpose and Need, consideration would be given to the extent each alternative would:

1. Continue to provide interpretation and environmental education opportunities for the public concerning the values for which the ACEC was designated.

## Conformance with Existing Land Use Plans

This EA is tiered to and in conformance with the *Coos Bay District Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement* (USDI 1994) and its *Record of Decision* (USDI 1995a) and the *Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS) on Management of Habitat for Last Successional and Old Growth Forest Related Species Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl (Northwest Forest Plan [NFP])* (USDA and USDI 1994a) and its *Record of Decision* (USDA and USDI 1994b) as supplemented and amended by:

- *Management of Port-Orford-cedar in Southwest Oregon Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement* (USDA and USDI 2004) and its *Record of Decision* (USDI 2004b).
- *Record of Decision and Standards and Guidelines for Amendments to the Survey and Manage, Protection Buffer, and other Mitigations Measures Standards and Guidelines* (USDA and USDI 2001).

## Documents Incorporated by Reference

The following documents were used to assist in the analysis of this project and are referenced within this environmental assessment:

- Final New River ACEC Management Plan May 1995 (USDI 1995b)
- New River Area of Critical Environmental Concern Management Plan Updated May 2004 (USDI 2004a)

## Decisions to be Made

The Field Manager of the Myrtlewood Field Office, Coos Bay BLM, must decide whether to construct a yurt for the purposes of interpretation and environmental education at the New River ACEC. This project is described in detail starting in Chapter 2.

The Field Manager must also determine if the selected alternative would or would not be a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. If the Manager decides it would not significantly affect the quality of the human environment, then the Manager can prepare and sign a FONSI (Finding of No Significant Impact).

If the Manager determines that the selected alternative would significantly affect the quality of the environment, then the project must either be dropped or modified, or have an EIS (Environmental Impact Statement) and a ROD (Record of Decision) prepared and signed before the project could proceed.

## Public Involvement

The primary purpose of scoping is to identify agency and public concerns relating to a proposed project and helps define the environmental impacts of concern to be examined in detail in the EA. The initial scoping process involved informing the public through a Scoping Letter, requesting comments on the proposal. Scoping letters were sent to adjacent landowners, agencies that have requested these documents, and other interested parties on the District NEPA mailing list. The Scoping Notice was published in The World newspaper on December 9, 2009, and posted on the District web page. The formal scoping period ran from December 9, 2009 – January 8, 2010. Only one comment was received; it concerned compliance of the project with the Coastal Zone Management Act.

## **Alternatives Considered but Eliminated**

### *Expanding the current Ellen Warring building*

Engineers conducted a preliminary draft proposal on removing the west wall and expanding the structure outward. For the addition of ten feet outward (approx 200 sq. ft. added) the cost of construction was estimated at close to \$100,000.

## **Chapter 2.0 Alternatives**

---

This Chapter provides a description of each alternative and summarizes the environmental consequences of the alternatives.

This EA contains an analysis of a no action alternative and a proposed action alternative. Analysis of the no action alternative is required under CEQ regulation §1502.14. For an action alternative to be considered it must meet the purpose and need while not violating any minimum environmental standards. The alternatives developed are consistent with the RMP and satisfy the purpose and need of implementing the RMP.

### **No Action Alternative**

The no action alternative provides a baseline for the comparison of the alternatives. This alternative describes the existing condition and the continuing trends.

The current level of interpretive and environmental education activities would remain static. There would be limited use of the New River ACEC from school groups.

In the near future (8-10 months), permanent interpretive exhibits will be fabricated for the main room, which will make it unavailable for use as a staging area for school groups or other educational programs. The exhibits would be used to contribute to school groups' learning and understanding of the ACEC but will occupy the majority of the floor space. This will prohibit conducting programs.

### **Proposed Action Alternative**

The proposed action is to install a 30-foot diameter yurt to function as an interpretive and educational facility at the Storm Ranch area of the New River ACEC. The semi-permanent structure will be placed in an open sand meadow, approximately 150 feet southeast of the Ellen Warring Learning Center. A 115-foot walk way would be constructed from the existing parking lot and vault toilets to the yurt. A deck measuring six ft. by ten ft. would be constructed on the front of the yurt to provide access to the structure. The yurt, deck and walkway would be ADA compliant. Landscaping would consist of native grasses, forbs and brush to match the surrounding habitat.

An electrical line would be run to the yurt from existing lines located by the parking area.

The yurt would be limited in use only for the purposes of interpretation, education and small group meetings. The yurt would not be used for the purposes of recreational events (such as family gatherings, weddings, etc.). Because of the limited availability, the yurt would be locked at all times other than for approved functions. Depending on the group, a BLM staff member would be present to conduct programs or the site host would be there to open and close the facility.

School groups would be led by BLM personnel and/or instructors on supervised activities. No more than two school buses a day per event (10-15 events total) would be scheduled for the ACEC during the school year, with one school bus being more likely based on demand, staffing and other considerations.

## **Chapter 3.0/4.0 Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences**

---

This Chapter combines the affected-environment (typically EA Chapter 3) and effects-analysis discussion (Chapter 4) and has been arranged by specific resource values that may be affected. The affected environment includes the current baseline conditions within the project area and includes other reasonably foreseeable actions as if they were completed on the ground. This Chapter also addresses the interaction between the effects of the proposed action and the environmental baseline, describing the effects that might be expected, how they would occur, and the incremental effects that could result.

### **Reasonably Foreseeable Actions**

Annual recurring activities are likely to occur within the project area. The ACEC is open year-round and receives between 12,000 and 15,000 visitors annually. The Storm Ranch site itself receives approximately 5,000 visitors per year who come for the fishing, hiking and other low-impact recreation opportunities.

### **Cumulative Effects Considerations**

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) provided guidance on June 24, 2005 as to the extent to which agencies of the Federal government are required to analyze the environmental effects of past actions when describing the cumulative environmental effect of a proposed action in accordance with Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). CEQ noted the “[e]nvironmental analysis required under NEPA is forward-looking,” and “[r]eview of past actions is only required to the extent that this review informs agency decision making regarding the proposed action.” This is because a description of the current state of the environment inherently includes effects of past actions. Guidance further states that “[g]enerally, agencies can conduct an adequate cumulative effects analysis by focusing on the current aggregate effect of past actions without delving into the historic details of individual past actions.”

The information on individual past actions is merely subjective, and would not be an acceptable scientific method to illuminate or predict the direct or indirect effects of the action alternative. The basis for predicting the direct and indirect effects of the action alternative should be based on generally accepted scientific methods such as empirical research. The cumulative effects of this project upon the environment did not identify any need to exhaustively list individual past actions in order to complete an analysis which would be useful for illuminating or predicting the effects of the proposed action.

## **Resources**

### **New River ACEC**

#### *Affected Environment*

The New River Area of Critical Environmental of Concern (ACEC) consists of 1,135 acres managed by the BLM for habitat biodiversity, cultural resource protection and recreation/environmental education. The ACEC is located within the New River Frontal Watershed, an area of approximately 99,572 acres, which encompasses the entire Floras Creek drainage. The proposed project area is located in an area where the focal point of development has been established (i.e. host site, restrooms, maintenance shed and visitor greeting center) called Storm Ranch.

#### *No Action*

There would be no change from the current condition, and no effect to the resource values for which the area was designated.

### Proposed Action

The action alternative would lead to the development of less than one-tenth of an acre of sand-meadow habitat in the project area. Two of the four primary resource values (wildlife habitat and unique plant communities) would be affected slightly through the loss of 1000 sq. ft. (.023 acres) of habitat. However, due to the small size of the project, and amount of similar habitat in the immediate vicinity of the proposal, the effects within the ACEC are negligible and keeping with what was identified under the 1995 Final New River ACEC Management Plan. In addition, since 2006, restoration efforts in the ACEC have been focused on restoring sand-meadow habitat, and the overall trend is for increasing amounts of this habitat type.

It is estimated that a maximum of 500 school children, with accompanying adults, would visit Storm Ranch annually if the proposed facility is constructed. This is only a slight increase in the number of students who have visited in recent years. Environmental education is an important component of both the 1995 and 2005 management plans (USDI 1995 and USDI 2004a). The plans emphasize managing visitor use to minimize impacts to the resources for which the ACEC was established. In order to monitor the effect of visitors on resource values, a Limits of Acceptable Change (LAC) planning system was implemented. The LAC provides a framework to measure potential impacts from visitors to resource and consist of four primary parts; photo points of vegetative conditions, song bird population abundance, level of recreation use and level of visitor satisfaction. Since the implementation of the LAC system in 1995, there have been no detectable negative effects to the primary resources. The addition of these school children in a controlled setting would not add any measureable negative effects.

## **Interpretation and Environmental Education**

### Affected Environment

The Ellen Warring Learning Center is the only building used for interpretation located at the Storm Ranch portion of the ACEC. This building holds a kitchen, small bedroom for use by researchers, and a larger room for holding activities and viewing displays. Without displays, the larger room can accommodate no more than 35 people. The building was not designed to allow for audio-video presentations.

### No Action

School groups, agency meetings, educational workshops etc. would continue to be staged in the Ellen Warring Learning Center as space allows. To fit larger groups, the temporary displays would have to be taken down and the room rearranged to accommodate people. The educational supplies, tables and chairs would be stowed into the bedroom, prohibiting its use by staff and researchers. Larger groups (35+ people) would be staged outside regardless of the weather or physical needs of the visitors.

When the interpretive displays are completed and installed within the building, there will be no opportunity to have programs within the building for groups larger than 10-15 people.

### Proposed Action

The addition of a yurt would complement the use of the Ellen Warring Learning Center and provide additional space to better serve the public as was intended in the Management Plan for the ACEC. A yurt would provide multi-functional space for programs, activities and storage that is needed for interpretation and environmental education, which directly contributes to the visitors' experience and appreciation of the New River ACEC.

## **Wildlife (Including T&E, S&M, SSS)**

### Affected Environment

The project area consists of a sand-meadow habitat. The site was formerly the horse corral for the Storm family residence.

There is no known suitable habitat for any federally listed wildlife species including northern spotted owls, marbled murrelet or western snowy plover within the project area. There are also no known Survey and Manage nor Special Status Species within the project area.

### No Action

The sand-meadow habitat in the project area would continue at its current development trajectory. In the absence of future disturbance, it is expected that the edges would become occupied with coyote brush (*baccharis pilularis*), an early successional pioneer species in the area, followed shortly by Pacific wax myrtle (*Myrica californica*), evergreen huckleberry (*Vaccinium ovatum*) and shore pine (*pinus contorta*). The conversion from sand-meadow to coastal scrub forest would occur within the next 10 years.

Over the last 5 years, an active sand-meadow restoration effort has implemented in the ACEC. Current trends for this habitat type are for a stable to increasing amount of this habitat type. The project area represents less than 1% of this habitat within the ACEC.

Some wildlife species associated with sand-meadow/coastal shrub habitat would continue to utilize the project area. Wildlife species associated with this habitat type include fox sparrows (*Passerella iliaca*) and yellow-rumped warblers (*Dendroica coronate*) (Johnson et al. 2001).

### Proposed Action

Activities involved with the proposed action would cause temporary disturbance to a variety of wildlife species during construction and when in use by groups. These effects would be temporary in nature and would not affect any species on a population scale.

Within the project area, there is not one species that exclusively uses sand-meadow habitat, to fulfill their life history requirements. Due to the increase in human presence associated with the yurt, it is likely there could be displacement of individual birds utilizing the nearby brush such as song sparrow (*Melospiza melodia*). However, these effects are negligible on a population basis.

The plans emphasize managing visitor use to minimize impacts to resources, including wildlife. Under the 2005 plan, a program was implemented to monitor recreational use of effects on wildlife species. Since 1995, breeding bird surveys have been conducted monitoring the effects of recreation on wildlife. A series of points near existing trails, and “off trail” control points were established. Birds were monitored by “ear”, and statistical comparisons between the two types of points were analyzed to determine recreational effects. If effects on breeding birds were detected, then it would be assumed there was an effect on other types of wildlife. Since the implementation of the monitoring, there have been no measureable effects from visitors on breeding birds

## **Botany (Including T&E, S&M, SSS)**

### Affected Environment

There are no T & E species known or suspected to occur in the project area. There is no habitat for any Survey and Manage or special status fungal species in the project area. There are 24 Survey and Manage and/or Bureau Sensitive vascular, lichen, or bryophyte plant species suspected of possibly occurring in the project area (Appendix A). This determination is based on the proposed project overlapping the known or

suspected range of a species as well as the likelihood that potential habitat is present. Potential habitat is determined by review of information on each species habitat requirements and proximity of known site locations.

#### No Action

If the meadow remained undisturbed the current mix of plant species would likely remain unchanged and no T & E, Survey and Manage, or Special Status Species would be affected since none occur in the project area.

#### Proposed Action

Many of the grass and forb species in the meadow are non-native and there are no trees species actually in the project area although there are trees and dense brush adjacent to the project area. Pre-disturbance vascular plant and bryophyte and lichen surveys were done on 21 January 2010 and no T & E, Survey and Manage, or Special Status plant Species were located. The meadow area at and adjacent to the project area had been surveyed informally on other occasions and no T & E, Survey and Manage, or special status plants were noted on any other visit either. Construction of the yurt would not affect any T & E, Survey and Manage, or Special Status plant Species.

### **Resources Not Analyzed in Detail**

#### **Water Quality/Hydrology/Fisheries**

There are no surface water features within the project area. There are no streams, floodplains, or other riparian areas that could be affected.

#### **Cultural Resources/Environmental Justice/Native American Concerns**

This area has been examined for cultural resources as part of several previous projects. Significant cultural resources were not found in this vicinity during these surveys.

#### **Recreation**

The establishment of a yurt next to the New River Learning Center could have some minor impacts to recreation. Some people come to hike the trails at New River because of the light usage and the feeling of solitude and privacy. School buses arriving with large numbers of children (up to 50) would temporarily impact the experience of some hikers. However, these individuals would probably simply rearrange their schedules to avoid potential conflicts with schoolchildren. Information would be posted about when these events will be occurring would help regular hikers plan their visits accordingly.

#### **Unaffected Resources**

None of the following critical elements of the human environment are located within the project area or within a distance to be affected by implementation of either alternative:

- Farmlands, Prime or Unique
- Flood Plains (as described in Executive Order 11988)
- Wild and Scenic Rivers
- Wilderness Values

## Chapter 5.0 Literature Cited

---

- USDA, and USDI. 1994a. Final - Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on Management of Habitat for the Late-Successional and Old-Growth Forest Related Species Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl. *SEIS*. U.S. Dept. of Agriculture - Forest Service, U.S. Dept. of the Interior - Bureau of Land Management, Portland, OR. <http://www.or.blm.gov/nwfp.htm>
- USDA, and USDI. 1994b. Record of Decision for Amendments to Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Planning Documents within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl; Standards and Guidelines for Management of Habitat for Late-successional and Old-growth Forest Related Species within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl. *Record of Decision*. U.S. Dept. of Agriculture - Forest Service, U.S. Dept. of the Interior - Bureau of Land Management, Portland, OR. <http://www.or.blm.gov/nwfp.htm>
- USDA, and USDI. 2001. Record of Decision and Standards and Guidelines for Amendments to the Survey and Manage, Protection Buffer, and other Mitigation Measures Standards and Guidelines. *Record of Decision*. U.S. Dept. of Agriculture - Forest Service, U.S. Dept. of the Interior - Bureau of Land Management, Portland, OR.
- USDA, and USDI. 2004. Final - Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Management of Port-Orford-Cedar in Southwest Oregon. *SEIS*. U.S. Dept. of Agriculture - Forest Service, U.S. Dept. of the Interior - Bureau of Land Management, Portland, OR.
- USDI. 1994. Final: Coos Bay District Proposed Resource Management Plan Environmental Impact Statement. U.S. Dept. of the Interior - Bureau of Land Management, North Bend, OR. <http://www.or.blm.gov/coosbay/rmp/index.htm>
- USDI. 1995a. Coos Bay District Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan. *Resource Management Plan*. U.S. Dept. of the Interior - Bureau of Land Management, North Bend, OR. <http://www.or.blm.gov/coosbay/rmp/index.htm>
- USDI. 1995b. Final New River ACEC Management Plan. U.S. Dept. of the Interior - Bureau of Land Management, North Bend, OR.
- USDI. 2004a. New River Area of Critical Environmental Concern Management Plan Updated May 2004. U.S. Dept. of the Interior - Bureau of Land Management - Coos Bay District - Myrtlewood Resource Area, North Bend, OR.
- USDI. 2004b. Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan Amendment for Management of Port-Orford-Cedar in Southwest Oregon, Coos Bay, Medford, and Roseburg Districts. *Record of Decision*. U.S. Dept. of the Interior - Bureau of Land Management, Portland, OR.

## Chapter 6.0 List of Preparers

---

Aimee E.B. Hoefs	Team Lead, Environmental Protection Specialist
Kip Wright	Project Lead, ACEC Coordinator, Wildlife Biologist
Sharon Cawley	Interpretive Specialist
Heather Lester	Recreation/Interpretation Aid
Reg Pullen	Recreation Planner
Tim Rodenkirk	Botanist
David Wash	District Recreation Planner

## Chapter 7.0 List of Agencies and Persons Contacted

---

The following public agencies and interested parties were notified directly with Scoping Letters:

Association of O&C Counties	Kalmiopsis Audubon Society
Coast Range Association	Klamath-Siskiyou Wildlands Center
Coos County Board of Commissioners	NW Environmental Defense Council
Coquille Indian Tribe	Oregon Coastal Program
Division of State Lands	Oregon Department of Forestry
Douglas Timber Operators	Oregon Parks and Recreation Department
Governors Natural Resources Office	Oregon Wild
Umpqua Watersheds	Numerous Private Citizens