

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-ORE060-2015-004-DNA

PROJECT NAME: Anthony Creek LWD Restoration Project

LOCATION/LLEGAL DESCRIPTION: T 19S, R 1W, Section 31

A. Description of Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

This project would harvest (cut down and transport) up to 11 trees in close proximity to road 19-1-10 (trees could be felled to the road) within 1/4 mile from placement sites in Anthony Creek tributary. Trees to be felled would be flagged with white and pink flagging and would be either located within 30 feet of the road or could be felled to the access trails or sites to be placed instream. Logs would be placed using large machinery (excavator) and would follow an access route from the road to approximately three stream sites. This access route would be flagged in lime green and white flagging from the road, and placement site would be flagged and numbered. See site map for tree harvest sites and log placement locations in Anthony Creek and the unnamed tributary stream.

Surveys for special status plants at the Project site would be completed prior to project implementation in the spring. If special status plants are found within the project area, appropriate actions would be taken to prevent damage to them.

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 applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

Watershed Restoration is identified as one of the three components of the Aquatic Conservation Strategy. As stated in the Eugene District ROD, "watershed restoration will be an integral part of a program to aid recovery of fish habitat, riparian habitat, and water quality. The most important components are control and prevention of road-related runoff and sediment production, restoration of the condition of riparian vegetation, and restoration of instream habitat complexity (Eugene District ROD 1995, pg. 20)."

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

Environmental Assessment for Eugene District Aquatic and Riparian Restoration Activities (Aquatic Restoration EA) EA # DOI-BLM-OR-090-2009-0009-EA

National Marine Fisheries Service Fish Habitat Consultation for Fish Habitat Restoration Activities in Oregon and Washington Biological Opinion (2008/03506) (ARBO I)

Reinitiation of Aquatic Restoration Activities in States of Oregon and Washington

NMFS Consultation Number: NWR-2013-9664 (ARBO II)

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 Project was analyzed in the Aquatic Restoration EA to occur anywhere on the District.

Projects of this type were specifically proposed and analyzed in the Aquatic Restoration EA. The purpose of this action is to use aquatic and riparian restoration activities identified in the National Marine Fisheries Service Fish Habitat Consultation for Fish Habitat Restoration Activities in Oregon and Washington Biological Opinion (2008/03506) (ARBO) to improve aquatic and riparian habitat on BLM-administered lands and non-BLM-administered lands, and to prioritize watersheds where aquatic and restoration activities would be emphasized. Project activities would include:

- Large Wood, Boulder, and Gravel Placement (pg 4 Restoration EA).

- 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 changes to the existing environment or resource values have occurred that would trigger the initialization of new NEPA analysis for this project.

- 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 analyzed these types of projects 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 effects analyzed in the Aquatic Restoration EA were programmatic in nature and are essentially similar to the proposed action. The Interdisciplinary Team reviewed the project and determined that there would be no effects to resources beyond those 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?**

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 FONSI were mailed to interested individuals on the Eugene District mailing list.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Resource	Signature
Kristine Struck	P & E Coordinator	NEPA	/s/ Kristine Struck
Steve Liebhardt	Fish Biologist	Fish	/s/ Steve Liebhardt
Cheryl (Cheshire) Mayrsohn	Botanist	Vegetation, Weeds	/s/ Cheshire Mayrsohn
Susan (Rudy) Wiedenbeck	Soil Scientist	Soil	/s/ Rudy Wiedenbeck
Chris Langdon	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife	/s/ Chris Langdon
Andy Hamilton	Hydrology	Hydrology	/s/ Andy Hamilton
Douglass Fuller	Forester	Timber	/s/ Janet Zentner
Jessica LeRoy	Civil Engineer Tech.	Roads	/s/ Jessica Le Roy
Heather Ulrich	Archaeologist	Archaeology	/s/ Heather Ulrich

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/ Steve Liebhardt

Date: May 13, 2015

Steve Liebhardt, Fish Biologist

Signature of NEPA Coordinator:

/s/ Kristine M. Struck

Date: May 26, 2015

Kristine M. Struck, P&EC

Signature of the Responsible Official:

/s/ William O'Sullivan

Date: May 28, 2015

William O'Sullivan, 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.

Appendix A Project Design Features from Aquatic Restoration EA

To prevent the introduction or spread of invasive plants:

Seed all disturbed ground using Government provided seed

Wash all equipment and vehicles prior to entering the project area. It should be clean of all plant material(s), mud, or material that could transport seeds or plant material.

No equipment, vehicles, and materials are to be staged in known invasive plant populations.

All equipment brought into the project area (clean fill, straw, gravel, large wood) should be free of invasive plant material(s).

Minimize soil disturbance as part of restoration project(s) and retain native vegetation to the extent practical.

To prevent damage to soils/aquatics resources:

Placement sites

To minimize loss of soil productivity and reduce the potential for surface runoff, erosion, and subsequent degradation due to surface disturbance and compaction.

Restrict machine operations to designated access trails only, and limit operations to periods of low soil moisture when soils have the most resistance to compaction.

Decompact/till access routes immediately after project completion, then seed and mulch with BLM supplied native species. To improve and accelerate soil/site productivity and hydrological process recovery, logs, woody debris and brush would be scattered across the tilled surfaces. Barricade all entry points with logs, woody debris and brush to block vehicular access.

Designated access routes have been planned to minimize damage to all standing hardwood and conifer trees.

All operations are planned during the in-water work window as defined by Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW). Any work outside of this period would require waivers from ODFW and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). Instream work window for the Lost Creek Watershed is July 1 through August 31.

Harvest Sites

Machinery will stay on the roadbed at all times.

Placement and Harvest Sites

Removal, notification, transport and disposal of any diesel, hydraulic fluid, or other petroleum product released into soil and/or water to be accomplished in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations.

Keep a Spill Contamination Kit (SCK) on-site during any operation within the project area. Prior to starting work each day, check all machinery for leaks and make necessary repairs.

Operators would be responsible for the clean-up, removal and proper disposal of contaminated materials from the site.

Refuel equipment, including chainsaws and other hand power tools, at least 100 feet from water bodies to prevent direct delivery of contaminants into streams and wetlands.

To reduce impacts to aquatic resources:

Use waterbars, barricades, seeding, and mulching to stabilize bare soil areas along project access routes prior to the wet season.

Rehabilitate and stabilize disturbed areas where soil will support seed growth by seeding and planting with native seeds mixes or plants.

Do not store equipment in stream channels when not in use.

Minimize damage of hardwoods within 50 feet of stream bank.

To minimize the risk of placed logs and boulders moving downstream during flood events:

Use key logs that are 1.5 times the active channel width and at least 24" in diameter.

Key logs would be wedged between trees on banks to prevent movement in high flow events.

To protect objects of cultural value:

If any cultural and/or paleontological resource (historic or prehistoric site or object) is discovered during project activities all operations in the immediate area of such discovery shall be suspended until an evaluation of the discovery can be made by a professional archaeologist to determine appropriate actions to prevent the loss of significant cultural or scientific values.

To reduce impacts to wildlife species:

Project activities will not occur between March 1 and July 15, both days inclusive.

Project activities may be stopped at any time to avoid impacts to T&E, BLM Special Status Species, or Bald/Golden eagles.

Snags shall be reserved except as necessary for human safety. Activities shall be relocated away from snags occupied by sensitive species, if feasible. Snags occupied by sensitive species that must be felled shall not be felled when in active use. All felled snags shall be left on site as coarse woody debris.

Existing coarse woody debris and rootwads shall be reserved and protected from damage to the extent possible. Coarse woody debris may be moved around project sites to facilitate operations.

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

DECISION RECORD

DOI-BLM-OR-E060-2015-004-DNA
Anthony Creek Large Woody Debris Project DNA

DECISION

It is my decision to implement this action as described in the Determination of NEPA Adequacy documentation DOI-BLM-OR-E060-2014-004-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:

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

May 28, 2015
Date: