

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

1791A CE-99-52

EUGENE DISTRICT

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION REVIEW

Background

The State Highway Route 126 is being widened west of the intersection with Danebo Road within the urban growth boundary of city of Eugene, Oregon. During project construction, a small population of white topped-aster (*Aster curtus*), a Bureau Sensitive species, was found to be located within the area where a new sidewalk is planned in conjunction with widening of State Highway 126. If the highway widening and sidewalk are built as planned, this population would be eliminated if it is not transplanted to a new location. The present location of the aster population is on land owned by the City of Eugene and occupies approximately one square meter area. The Eugene District - Bureau of Land Management (BLM) owns land immediately north of the impacted property that also contains a number of patches of white-topped aster. The City of Eugene has requested that the BLM allow transplanting of the aster plants onto BLM property. Two patches of aster that are currently on BLM lands could be also be impacted by this project; the sidewalk is planned to be constructed very near these population patches. A small retaining wall will be built during construction activities to minimize impacts to these two patches of aster on BLM lands.

Proposed Action

The proposed action is to allow the City to transplant the population of white-topped aster that would be eliminated by the highway widening and sidewalk construction onto the adjacent BLM property in an area appropriate for establishment of this species. Transplanting would be accomplished with a backhoe and/or other construction equipment and hand tools. An area of not greater than five square meters in area would be disturbed during transplanting.

Decision

The BLM authorizes the City to transplant the population of white-topped aster that would be eliminated by widening of Highway 126 onto the adjacent BLM property. BLM personnel will assist State, City and construction personnel in transplanting the patch of aster that would be impacted by the highway widening project onto the adjacent BLM property. The transplants would be watered until the fall rains ensue. The transplanted population and the two patches of aster on BLM lands will be monitored by the City for a three year period (2000-2002) following transplanting this fall. A brief yearly summary of project implementation and population presence, establishment, and impacts will be compiled for these three years by the City for the BLM and available to the public.

Rationale

The Proposed Action qualifies as a categorical exclusion as described in the Departmental Manual (516 DM 6.5, Appendix 5.4, E.(19) and does not meet any of the exception criteria.

Prepared by: Kathy L. Ford
Coast Range Resource Area Botanist

Date: 9/8/99

Reviewed by: Mary Hogue
Planner/Environmental Coordinator

Date: 9/9/99

Approved by: Don M. Howell, acting
Area Manager

Date: 9/9/99

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION REVIEW

Exception Criteria Review Checklist

Proposed Action: Transplanting white-topped aster (*Aster curtus*)

Review the proposed action against each of the 10 criteria listed below. If the project meets one or more of the criteria, it is an exception from categorical exclusion and **MUST** be analyzed in an EA or EIS. To qualify as a Categorical Exclusion the proposed action may not meet any of the criteria. If the criterion does not apply, indicate "Not Applicable." Any mitigation measures (such as contract stipulations or terms and conditions on permits) necessary to ensure that the proposed action qualifies as a categorical exclusion should be identified at the bottom of the page.

Exception Criteria		Comments
1.	Have significant adverse effects on public health or safety	None
2.	Have adverse effects on unique resources (i.e., parks, recreation, refuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers, wetlands, flood plains, etc.)	None
3.	Have highly controversial environmental effects	None
4.	Have highly uncertain environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks	None
5.	Establish a precedent that could result in significant impacts	None
6.	Be directly related to other actions having cumulatively significant effects	None
7.	Have adverse effects on cultural or historical resources	None
8.	Have adverse effects on species listed or proposed as threatened or endangered or have adverse effect on designated critical habitat for these species.	None 
9.	Require compliance with E.O. 11988 (flood plain management), E.O. 11990 (protection of wetlands), or the Fish & Wildlife Coordination Act	None
10.	Threaten to violate Federal, State, Local or Native American law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment	None
Mitigation measures needed to qualify as CE: None		

Reviewed By: 
 Gary Hoppe, Planner

Date: 9/9/99

Area Manager: 
 Diane Chung

Date: 9/9/99