

# Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)  
Eugene District, Oregon

## Turtle Swale Fill Removal OR090-DNA-05-10

---

### **A. Description of the Proposed Action**

The Proposed Action is to remove 27,866 cubic yards of fill material in the fall 2005 to enhance wetlands in the Turtle Swale Unit, located south of West Royal Avenue on, T 17S–R4W–Sect.29, in Eugene, Oregon. The area to be affected is a temporary maintenance road (approximately 2,200 feet in length) that was built during the construction phase of the **Lower Amazon Creek Wetlands Restoration Project in 1999.**

### **Background**

During implementation of the Lower Amazon Creek Wetlands Restoration Project in 1999, a temporary maintenance road was constructed to allow heavy equipment to access the site. The road is approximately 2,200 feet long, and was created to allow equipment used in levee removal (e.g., large excavators, bulldozers, and dump trucks) to access the site. The intent of the project planners was to remove this temporary maintenance road once the project was completed.

Now that Lower Amazon Creek Wetlands Restoration Project has been fully implemented, it would be beneficial to remove the road, consistent with the original plans, for several reasons. First, the road is beginning to serve as a linear corridor for aggressive, non-native, upland weeds. Second, the road blocks the flow of water between Amazon Creek and the wetlands in Turtle Swale. Third, the road has provided undesired access for users of the Fern Ridge Multi-Use path into the core of the Turtle Swale wetlands.

Removal of this temporary maintenance road would be immediately followed by seeding with a high density of native, Willamette Valley prairie grasses and forbs that are suited to the site's hydrology.

### **B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans**

This action is consistent with the West Eugene Wetland Plan, adopted by the BLM in 1993 (City of Eugene 1992). BLM also accepted the updated Plan modified in 2000. BLM has determined that the WEW Plan is the equivalent of a Resource Management Plan.

The WEW Plan calls for establishing, maintaining and protecting physical and hydrologic

linkages between protected wetlands (Policy 3.8), and assisting with the restoration of the Lower Amazon Creek wetlands and floodplain area (Recommended Action 4.4), which includes the current Proposed Action area.

**C. Identify the applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the Proposed Action.**

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the Proposed Action.

- US Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) EA – Amazon Creek Wetland Restoration Project (August, 1996)

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the Proposed Action (e.g., source drinking water assessments, biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, rangeland health standard's assessment and determinations, and monitoring the report).

- Lower Amazon Meadowlark Prairie Mitigation Improvement Plan (February, 1999)

**D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria**

**1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed?**

The Proposed Action is similar to the actions previously analyzed in the ACOE Environment Analysis (1996), which was implemented during 1998-2000. That analysis evaluated the effects of fill removal (levee removal & wetland restoration activities) on Turtle Swale Unit as well as on other adjacent parcels. By removing a levee constructed to implement the 1998 plan, the present action would occur within the same location as previously analyzed in the ACOE EA-1998 for substantially the same purpose.

**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, resource values, and circumstances?**

Yes – the Environment Assessment analyzed an appropriate range of alternatives given the purpose and need for the project. Two alternative were analyzed, the Proposed Action Alternative A (levee removal & wetland restoration activities) and Alternative B (no action). No additional concerns or circumstances have risen to require new alternatives.

**3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances.**

Yes –These findings are consistent with the effects analysis of the previous environmental analysis. In addition, the resources within the area identified for this current action are the same

as the area treated under the ACOE EA-1998.

**4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?**

Yes – the issues remain the same. There is no new information that would cause a reevaluation of the area or any new events that have changed the context for the current action.

**5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?**

Yes – Impacts from the continued treatment of fill removal for native wetland habitat restoration would remain the same. The fill removal would occur within the same location as previously analyzed in the ACOE EA-1998 for the same purpose. There have been no changes in condition that would require new or additional analyses.

**6. Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?**

Yes – The current action fits well within the analysis of the previous much larger suite of actions already completed. No cumulative impacts are anticipated from the implementation of this action beyond those already described in the ACOE EA-1998.

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

Yes – The EA and associated decision availability was advertised in the Eugene Register Guard, sent to interested persons on our EA mailing lists and was coordinated with The Nature Conservancy.

**E. Interdisciplinary Analysis:** Identify those team members conducting or participating in the preparation of this worksheet.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>
Sally Villegas	Wildlife Biologist
Dharmika Henshel	Botanist
Rick Colvin	Landscape Planner

**Reviewed by:**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
NEPA Coordinator

8/25/05  
Date

**CONCLUSION**

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the Applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the Proposed Action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

**Approved by:**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Steve Calish, Field Manager, Siuslaw Resource Area

8/25/05  
Date