Worksheet
Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

Office: Klamath Falls Resource Area, Lakeview District

NEPA Log #: DOI-BLM-OR-L040-2013-26-DNA

Proposed Action Title/Type: Horton Rim Unit 5 Juniper Reduction

Location: T. 39S R. 11E, Section 19, and T. 39S R. 11.5 E, Sections 22, 23 and 24. The project area is East of Klamath Falls, OR; and South of Dairy, OR (See attached map)

Description of the Proposed Action:
The proposed action consists of cutting approximately 394 acres of western juniper from within the Horton Rim Unit # 5 (see map) and disposing of the cut material through a variety of methods. Cutting would be accomplished by heavy equipment and hand crews with chainsaws. Individual juniper trees exhibiting signs of being older than approximately 150 years would be reserved from cutting (see Section F, Project Design Features/Mitigation Measures, under "Vegetation" for characteristics of older juniper trees).

Disposal of the cut material would be achieved mostly through yarding with heavy equipment and subsequent utilization. Some areas would have the material piled by machine and the piles burned. Other areas would have material piled by hand. Hand piles would be covered with plastic sheeting, and later burned. Steepness of slope, accessibility of the material, and the size and value of the severed material at time of cutting will determine where each of these disposal methods is applied within the cutting unit. Piles would be burned under moisture conditions that would mostly limit fire to the individual piles. All burning would be accomplished in accordance with an approved burn plan, and comply with state and federal smoke management policy. Burn pile scars from machine piles (and possibly from hand piles), skid roads, and landings would be revegetated with native species through a variety of methods including: planting of bitterbrush and mountain mahogany seedlings, seeding with native grass species, and seeding with native sage species.

B. Conformance with one or more of the following Land Use Plans (LUPs) and/or Related Subordinate Implementation Plans:

Klamath Falls Record of Decision and Resource Management (KFRA ROD/RMP), June 1995.

The KFRA ROD/RMP states on page 56 *"Specifically, plan harvest of marketable western juniper woodlands for improvement of forest or range land ecosystem or watershed conditions. Up to 1,000 acres per year of juniper woodland could be harvested for commercial forest products."*

The KFRA ROD/RMP states on page 63 *"Construct range land improvement projects as needed to support achievement of management objectives. Rangeland improvements may include, but are not limited to fence and reservoir construction, spring developments, vegetation manipulation, and prescribed burns."*

C. Identify the applicable NEPA document(s) that cover the proposed action.

Horton Rim/Dairy and Windy Ridge Rangeland Health Treatments, Habitat Restoration, and Urban Interface Protection (EA OR-014-01-02), January 2002.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

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

Yes, the current proposed action includes portions of the original project that have not yet been completed on the ground. The actions (juniper cutting, piling, burning, and removal) are identical to those analyzed in the environmental assessment.

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 range of alternatives is the same; there has been no significant change in the environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances.

3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (including, for example, riparian proper functioning condition [PFC] reports; rangeland health standards assessments; Unified Watershed Assessment categorizations; inventory and monitoring data; most recent Fish and Wildlife Service lists of threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species; most recent BLM lists of sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the proposed action?

A review was conducted by the KFRA interdisciplinary team with a field trip on May 1, 2013 to determine if any new information, studies, and/or analyses has been collected/completed since 2002 that would materially differ from that collected/completed during the Environmental Assessment process. The existing analysis and conclusions were determined to be adequate.

The proposed project area was reviewed and necessary surveys were conducted for identification of Cultural Resources.

The KFRA botanist reviewed the project area and determined that surveys for Special Status Plants were not needed due to absence of potential habitat.

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 anticipated impacts of the proposed action are identical to those identified in the Environmental Analysis. The Environmental Analysis (EA) specifically analyzed impacts to the unit currently identified for treatment. The EA and Decision Record authorized up to 3,000 acres to be treated. A total of 1,846 acres have been treated to date (1,660 acres on Horton Rim and 186 acres on Windy Ridge).

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

The KFRA has conducted a number of tours with the general public, as well as interagency field trips, to review the fuels and range restoration work that has been completed to date elsewhere on the resource area. In addition, there have been a number of newspaper articles discussing the juniper encroachment issue on both private and federal lands and the benefit of treating the juniper to maintain the historic rangeland plant communities.

E. Interdisciplinary Team:

Name	Title	Resource Represented
Shane Durant	Assistant Field Manager	Biomass/ utilization
Cindy Foster	Soil Scientist	Soils
Brooke Brown	Archaeologist	Cultural
Matt Broyles	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife (author)
Mike Angell	Forester	Biomass/ utilization
Dana Eckard	Range Management Specialist	Rangeland health
Andy Hamilton	Hydrologist	Hydrology
Julia Zoppetti	Fuels Management Specialist	Fuels, fire, and air quality
Johanna Fickenscher	Botanist	Botany and Weeds
Grant Weidenbach	Recreation Planner	Visual resources
Terry Austin	Environmental Planner	Environmental coordination

F. Project Design Features/Mitigation Measures:
The following Project Design Features (PDFs) and Mitigation Measures will be incorporated during implementation.

Wildlife/Vegetation

• All juniper considered “old growth” would be retained. Old growth is generally defined as any tree over the age of 150 years old and these trees are typically distinct in appearance. Their canopy becomes increasingly non-symmetrical in appearance with rounded-top canopies, canopies that contain dead limbs or spike tops, largely irregular tapering trunks, and deeply furrowed and fibrous bark. Younger trees (< 150 years) are more conical shaped and the bark is more typically scaly rather than furrowed (Miller et al 1999).

• The rangeland permittees will be requested to rest the allotment for at least one year and preferably two years after treatment in areas where greater than 35% of the allotment was treated. The KFRA range specialist will coordinate this action with the rangeland permittees.

• The contractor will be required to rinse machinery used in mechanical methods prior to moving onto the project area and prior to leaving an area with noxious weeds present, to prevent the potential spread of noxious weeds and other non-native species.

• Some selected younger (< 150 years) juniper trees may be retained as wildlife habitat.

• The proposed project area is classified as critical win ter range for mule deer. No activities (including juniper cutting, piling, or burning; and vegetative planting or seeding specific to the alternative) will occur between November 15 and April 15 (unless approved by a KFRA wildlife biologist).

• Cut juniper may be utilized (fence posts, firewood, lumber, biomass, etc.), if economically and logistically

feasible.

Prescribed Fire
• Pile burning, prescribed fire, and smoke management will be subject to KFRA Programmatic EA #O14-94-9 addressing the use of prescribed fire.

• Adjacent landowners and residents will be notified at least 30 days prior to burning.

Resources
• The proposed project area will be reviewed and necessary surveys conducted for cultural, botanical, and biological clearances, prior to any ground disturbing activity being implemented. (NOTE: The proposed project area has been reviewed and necessary surveys were conducted for identification of cultural resources).

• Special Status Plants requiring protection will be buffered according to guidance provided by the resource area's botanist, and the area within these buffers will not be treated.

• Cultural sites requiring protection will be buffered according to guidance provided by the resource area's archaeologist, and the area within these buffers will not be treated.

• If any cultural sites are located during project implementation, activities will be temporarily suspended until appropriate mitigating measures are developed and the resource area archaeologist has provided clearance to proceed.

Soils
• The use of mechanical harvesters will be restricted to dry conditions to minimize soil compaction and soil disturbance, per the Klamath Falls Resource Area (KFRA) RMP/FEIS, Appendix F, pp. 23-24.

• Best Management Practices guidelines identified in the KFRA RMP/FEIS, Appendix F, on the use of a mechanical shear will be followed.

• In the event that felled juniper is commercially utilized, ground-bas ed yarding would not occur on slopes greater than 35% (KFRA RMP/EIS page F-24).

Water Resources
• In the event that felled juniper is commercially utilized, skid trails will be designated and would only cross drainages at designated crossings. If deemed necessary, the crossings will be armored with suitable material (e.g., rocks or juniper boles) and/or rehabilitated following the completion of yarding activities (KFRA RMP/EIS page F-22).

• If used, skid trails and landings will be rehabilitated according to BMPs (KFRA RMP/EIS, pages F23-F25) following the completion of yarding activity. Specifically, waterbars will be constructed across skid trails to minimize diversion of hydrologic flow paths, and berms or logs will be placed to ensure that skid trails are not open for off highway vehicle use.

• Where possible, treatment units within the proposed area will be designed to reduce the visual effects by feathering edges, creating uneven borders, and leaving selected juniper. Management activities should not dominate the view of the casual observer.
• Ephemeral/intermittent drainages may need a buffer on both sides in which only selected vegetation

would be cut. The resource area riparian team would determine the size of buffer and treatment within.

• If juniper immediately adjacent to stream channels is designated for removal, hand-felling will be utilized if there is a risk to streambank stability. Mechanical treatments could occur adjacent to streams with stable banks.

• If it is found that juniper encroachment is affecting the development of riparian plant communities in the vicinity of the spring in T.39S R.11½E, section 15, thinning activities may take place there. Such treatments will rely on hand-felling, rather than mechanical harvesting, and yarding access may b e limited or prohibited if site conditions suggest that resource damage could occur. If yarding is not feasible, felled trees may be hand-piled and burned.

• The road that traverses T. 39S, R. 11½ E, section 24 from the SE to the NW is contributing runoff and sediment to the adjacent ephemeral stream channel. If this road is used under the proposed action, portions of it should have waterbars or other appropriate drainage features installed upon completion of the project.

Roads

• If applicable, roads would be designed from juniper chips to minimize impacts to soils and reduce the longevity of the roads existence. Juniper trees within the project area would be chipped and used as the roads base materials .

• Install water gaps in chip roads at intervals equal to the waterbar spacing lengths described in the KFRMP/EIS (page D-25). Water gaps will be constructed by removing the road base for approximately 10 feet, thereby removing the constructed berm that would otherwise divert flow paths for long distances.

• Obliterate the chip roads where it intersects existing traditionally -surfaced roads. This will help prevent the juniper roads form becoming integrated into the transportation network during the 10 to 15 years it will take for the road surface to decay.

• Chip roads will not be built where their construction would require excavation of cut slopes or construction of fill slopes.

CONCLUSION

Based on the review documented above, I determine 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.

Signature of the Responsible Official:

/s/ Donald J. Holmstrom *Date: 7/18/2013*

Name: Donald J. Holmstrom

Title: Field Manager, Klamath Falls Resource Area