

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

DETERMINATION OF NEPA ADEQUACY (DNA) WORKSHEET

OFFICE: Upper Willamette Resource Area

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-OR-E060-2013-0024-DNA

PROJECT NAME: Row River Trail - Bake-Stewart Trail Connection

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T.21.S, R.1.W, sec. 14

A. Description of Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

The proposed project would harden the surface of a trail connection between the Row River Trail administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the smaller Bake Stewart Trail administered by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The connection is currently a gravel bib approximately 17 feet long, 6 feet wide at the USACE portion, and 30 feet wide at the Row River Trail. The proposed action would keep the existing footprint but would install an asphalt surface like that utilized on the Row River Trail. The work would be performed by the USACE in October of 2013. The work would be anticipated to take approximately 1 day to complete.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

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

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions:

Recreation Objectives

Provide a wide range of developed and dispersed recreation opportunities that contributed to meeting projected recreation demand within the planning area.

Continue to provide nonmotorized recreation opportunities and create additional opportunities where consistent with other management objectives.

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

Row River Recreation Area Management Plan and Environmental Assessment OR-1792-95-1

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 a feature of:

Issue 2: Multiple Recreation Use and Conflicts

Dual Surfaces and Higher Development Trailheads

- Provide dual surface including a paved surface to support a variety of uses for hiking, bicycling, and full accessibility.”

Issue 3: Facility Development, Operation, and Maintenance

Operation and Maintenance would include

- Paving would provide more permanent barrier to intrusion of noxious weeds and other vegetation
- Work with other agencies to provide convenient, well spaced locations for additional parking, and access to swimming and fishing areas

- 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?**

Yes. The Row River Recreation Area Management Plan and Environmental Assessment OR-1792-95-1 analyzed No Action and a gravel surfaces alternatives as well as the proposed action of paved surfaces.

- 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?**

No new information or circumstances have arisen that would affect the validity of the analysis conducted in Row River Recreation Area Management Plan and Environmental Assessment OR-1792-95-1.

- 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 direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the proposed action are essentially similar to those analyzed in the Row River Recreation Area Management Plan and Environmental Assessment OR-1792-95-1.

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

Yes. There was extensive public involvement and interagency review for the Row River Recreation Area Management Plan and Environmental Assessment OR-1792-95-1. This included public scoping meetings, newsletters, a 45-day comment period, and meetings and field reviews with a variety of other agencies and organizations.

E. Persons/Agencies /BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource</u>
Elizabeth Aleman	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation
Darren Lemon	District Engineer	Engineering
Chris Langdon	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife
Heather Ulrich	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources
Kristine Struck	Planning and Environmental Coordinator	NEPA

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 constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

Signature of Project Lead:

/s/ Elizabeth Aleman
Elizabeth Aleman,
Outdoor Recreation Planner

Date: September 16, 2013

Signature of NEPA Coordinator:

/s/ Kristine M. Struck
Kristine M. Struck,
Planning and Environmental Coordinator

Date: September 16, 2013

Signature of the Responsible Official:

/s/ William O'Sullivan
William O'Sullivan
Upper Willamette Field Manager
Eugene District

Date: September 16, 2013

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.