A. Description of the Proposed Action:

The proposed action is to remove invasive shore pine (Pinus contorta), Sitka spruce (Picea sitchensis) and Douglas fir (Pseudotsuga menziesii) in four habitat types; open sand dune, blue berry bog, coastal lowland meadow, and Manzanita shrub lands. The intent of the proposed action is to maintain these habitat types and associated biodiversity from being lost through succession. For example, bog blueberry and tufted hairgrass shrubswamp (Vaccinium uliginosum – Deschampsia cespitosa) (special status species) are located at Storm Ranch and are presently being encroached by conifers and willows.

The project is located at New River Area of Critical Environmental Concern, which is located approximately 8 miles south of Bandon Oregon (see figure 1). There are four distinct access points to the area; Lost Lake is in the north, followed by Fourmile Creek, Storm Ranch and Floras Lake in the south. The project is proposed throughout the ACEC via all access points.

At each access point there are multiple meadows that need treatment. The following is the approximate meadow acreage for each access point: Storm Ranch – 100 acres; Lost Lake – 20 acres; Fourmile Creek – 3 acres; Floras Lake 20 acres. Individual encroaching trees in these boundaries would be removed. The Floras Lake acreage would have approximately 10 trees total removed initially while Storm Ranch would have approximately >100 trees removed. Most of these sites would have to be maintained annually as the trees are adjacent to the meadows and will continue to encroach.

Trees identified for removal would be cut using chainsaws, slashed into manageable size pieces and hand piled for burning. Piles would be allowed to dry and would be covered with plastic to prevent from becoming saturated with rain. Piles would be constructed in a manner that results in a clean burn with near 100 percent consumption and doesn’t damage nearby vegetation. Burning would most likely be conducted in the fall and winter after rain has set in to allow for safe burning.

Additionally, these habitats would be maintained through the re-introduction of fire which should discourage or eliminate undesired species, and restore conditions to promote native plants. Meadows would undergo a broadcast burn as needed. This would be determined annually through monitoring.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

This DNA is tiered to and in conformance with the Coos Bay District Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement (UDSI 1994) and its Record of Decision (UDSI 1995) 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:

- 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).

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

Enhance and maintain biological diversity and ecosystem health to contribute to healthy wildlife populations (RMP p. 27).

Use management practices – including fire – to obtain desired vegetation conditions in special habitats (RMP p. 28).

C. Identify applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

EA OR120-04-07 Historic Community Habitat Restoration Environmental Assessment
New River Area of Critical Environmental Concern Management Plan Updated May 2004

Other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, project management plans, water quality restoration plan and/or a monitoring report).

Watershed Analysis of the Sixes and New River Area, Coos and Curry County Oregon, January 2008

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?

The proposed action is essentially the same as addressed in the EA on page 7. The original EA analyzed the maintenance of unique habitat such as meadows and oak woodlands, but did not specifically address habitats such as bog blueberry marshlands and manzanita chaparral. Though the existing plant communities may not be exactly the same, the effects are parallel. Successional processes are leading to the replacement of unique habitats with the encroachment of conifers due to the lack of disturbance. This lack of disturbance (fire) has led to a decline in early seral habitats and their associated assemblage of plants and animals. This is the same issue that was analyzed in the EA.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

Yes, the EA analyzed three alternatives, the No Action alternative and two Action alternatives. The Action alternatives differed on the type of burning allowed (hand pile only, or hand pile and broadcast burn). The resource values, and environmental concerns identified in the EA accurately address the concerns in this proposed action.

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?

While there have been some new circumstances (Survey & Manage Litigation changes), these would not substantially change the effects analysis of the original EA. Resource concerns identified in the original NEPA document have remained the same and are adequately addressed under the original document. Since the EA was completed in 2004 there have been some changes in the Special Status Species (SSS) list for plants and animals. These have been updated in the supporting site-specific analysis for this project and there are no wildlife or botany Special Status Species on the current Director’s list within the project area.

Survey & Manage species were not required to be analyzed at the time of the original EA. However, there is no habitat in the project area that would require pre-disturbance surveys for the Red Tree Vole or any botany species.

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?
Yes, the effects are the same as described in the original EA.

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

Yes, the original NEPA document underwent public scoping and a full environmental review and no additional information exists under the current proposed action that would substantially change the identified affects.
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**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.
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