UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
EUGENE DISTRICT OFFICE

DETERMINATION OF NEPA ADEQUACY (DNA) WORKSHEET

OFFICE: Eugene District BLM

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-OR-E060-2013-0008-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER (if any):

PROJECT NAME: Seeley Creek Culvert Restoration

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T 15S, R1W, sec. 18.

APPLICANT (if any):

A. Description of Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

This project will place a channel-spanning boulder weir below a culvert on Seeley Creek (SL 2) and reseed the stream with washed river substrate. Boulders would be stored on the side of the road (15-1-19.1) adjacent the culvert. Boulders would be moved and placed in-stream with an excavator. This project is tentatively slated for implementation during the summer of 2013 and would be done during the in stream work window (June 1 to October 31), and is expected to take 1 day. SL 2 is staked next to the culvert and flagged in Orange on the road.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

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

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP 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 # DOI-BLM-OR-090-2009-0009-EA as Large Wood, Boulder, and Gravel Placement.

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 (boulder weirs) is specifically cited and analyzed in the Aquatic Restoration EA for projects like this within the Eugene District BLM. “Large wood and boulder projects would be designed to allow fish passage through or over structures at all stream flows. (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 in stream 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 FONSIs were mailed to interested individuals on the Eugene District mailing list.

E. Persons/Agencies /BLM Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Resource	Agency Represented
Francisca Paulete	NEPA Coordinator	NEPA	BLM
Steve Liebhardt	Fish Biologist	Fish	BLM
Cheshire Mayrsohn	Botanist	Vegetation	BLM
Rudy Wiedenbeck	Soil Scientist	Soil	BLM
Chris Langdon	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife	BLM
Todd Bush	Hydrologist	Water	BLM

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:

/s/ Steve Liebhardt Date: 5/2/13
Steve Liebhardt
Fish Biologist

Signature of NEPA Coordinator:

/s/ Francisca Paulete Date: 5/2/13
Francisca Paulete
NEPA Coordinator

Signature of the Responsible Official:

/s/ William O'Sullivan Date: 5/3/13
William O'Sullivan
Upper Willamette Field Manager

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.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
EUGENE DISTRICT OFFICE

DECISION RECORD

DOI-BLM-OR-E060-2013-0008-DNA
Seeley Creek Culvert Restoration Project

DECISION

It is my decision to implement this action as described in the Determination of NEPA Adequacy documentation DOI-BLM-OR-E060-2013-0008-DNA.

DECISION RATIONALE

The proposed action has been reviewed by BLM staff. The Proposed Action is in conformance with the 1995 Eugene District Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan (as amended). Based on the Determination of NEPA Adequacy, I have determined that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES

Any person adversely affected by this decision may appeal it to the Interior Board of Land Appeals (IBLA), Office of the Secretary, in accordance with the regulations contained in 43 CFR, Part 4. If an appeal is taken, a notice of appeal must be filed in this office within 30 days of this decision for transmittal to the Board. If a notice of appeal does not include a statement of reasons, such statement must be filed with this office and with the Board within 30 days after the notice of appeal was filed. A copy of a notice of appeal and any statement of reasons, written arguments, or briefs, must also be served upon the Regional Solicitor, Pacific Northwest Region, U.S. Department of the Interior, 805 SW Broadway, Suite 600, Portland, OR 97205.

Signature of the Responsible Official:

William O'Sullivan Upper Willamette Field Manager Eugene District Office	Date: