Office: Medford District Office, Butte Falls Resource Area

Tracking Number: DOI-BLM-OR-M050-2010-0005-DNA

Casefile/Project Number:
Butte Falls Hazardous Fuels Reduction Environmental Assessment
EA# DOI-BLM-OR-M050-2009-0035-EA

Proposed Action Title/Type: Pleasant Fry 901 and 320 Underburning

Location/Legal Description:
Township 34 South, Range 4 West, sections 9 and 32;
Willamette Meridian, Jackson County, Oregon (see maps).

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

The Butte Falls Resource Area, Medford District Bureau of Land Management (BLM) proposes to underburn 103 acres in previously completed fuels units as a prescribed fire maintenance treatment. Surface and ladder fuels were reduced by slashing, hand piling, and hand pile burning, as reviewed in the Pleasant Fry Fuel Hazard Reduction Categorical Exclusion. The underburn treatment would help maintain the desired condition of the identified areas. The proposed action is consistent with the actions analyzed in the Butte Falls Hazardous Fuels Reduction Environmental Assessment (EA).

Prescribed burning would occur on BLM-administered lands in the Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI) within the Pleasant Creek sixth field watershed. The project addresses the need to better protect the lives, property, and natural resources within the neighborhoods of Pleasant Creek Road from the risk of high intensity wild fires.

Project Design Features
Applicable project design features identified by the interdisciplinary team for the Butte Falls Fuels Hazard Reduction project will be implemented in this project (EA, p. 8-12)

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

This proposal is in conformance with the objectives, land use allocations, and management direction of the 1995 Medford District Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan (ROD/RMP) and any plan amendments in effect at the time this document is published. It also conforms with the 1994 Record of Decision for Amendments to Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Planning Documents Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl (Northwest Forest Plan).
C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

- **Categorical Exclusion/Decision Record for Fuel Hazard Reduction in the Wildland Urban Interface Pleasant Fry Project** (CE# OR115-08-17), April 2008.
- **Butte Falls Hazardous Fuels Reduction Environmental Assessment** (EA# DOI-BLM-OR-M050-2009-0035-EA), September 2009
- **Decision Record for Butte Falls Hazardous Fuels Reduction**, September 2009


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 consistent with the actions identified in the **Butte Falls Hazardous Fuels Reduction EA** (section 2.2.2.4, Maintenance Thinning and Underburning, EA, p. 8). The proposed action is located within the Project Area boundary for the EA. The two additional units proposed for underburning are within the same fifth field (Evans Creek) and sixth field (Pleasant Creek) watersheds as the EA. Resource conditions are similar to those identified in the 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 new action is the same as the action identified in the existing NEPA document. The resource values, environmental concerns, and interests are also the same.

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?

   A BLM interdisciplinary team of resource specialists reviewed the project and determined no significant changes in circumstances or significant new information have occurred since the EA was written. All surveys were completed for plants, wildlife, and cultural resources.
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 proposed action is not significantly different from the action analyzed in the EA. This project would include the applicable project design features identified in the EA. The impacts from this action are expected to be short-term and are within those anticipated from the proposed action in the EA. Adverse impacts would occur during implementation of the action and would not differ from the cumulative impacts analyzed in the EA.

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

The BLM initiated public scoping for the Butte Falls Hazardous Fuels Reduction EA on July 27, 2009 by mailing a letter to 421 adjacent landowners, businesses, organizations, tribes, government agencies, and other interested parties. The letter asked the recipient to identify any issues or concerns they may have with the proposed fuel reduction project. In response, the BLM received seven letters containing scoping comments. The scoping comments the BLM received from the public letters identified concerns with air quality as it relates to smoke from prescribed burning and pile burning (and burning the plastic used to cover the piles), long-term maintenance of the thinned areas, and access to proposed thinning areas.

The BLM held a public comment period for the EA from September 12 to September 28, 2009. The BLM notified the public through a newspaper notice in the Medford Mail Tribune and a letter mailed to 73 individuals, organizations, and government entities. The EA was posted on the BLM website or mailed to the public at their request. We received eight letters containing comments on the EA.

In addition, the Pleasant Creek Road neighborhoods were identified by the Seven Basins Fire Plan Steering Committee (SBFPSC) in the Seven Basins Community Wildfire Plan as a Wildland Urban Interface area at high risk from wildfires. The SBFPSC key members are Oregon Department of Forestry, Seven Basins Watershed Council, Oregon State University Extension, and Medford District BLM Butte Falls Resource Area. Some residents within the Pleasant Creek Road area have completed, or are in the process of completing, hazardous fuels reduction work on private lands adjacent to BLM-administered land. The original proposal was reviewed with the SBFPSC.
E. Persons/Agencies /BLM Staff Consulted

The following Butte Falls Resource Area resource specialists have reviewed this proposed action and have determined this action is covered in the Butte Falls Hazardous Fuels Reduction EA DOI-BLM-OR-M050-2009-0035-EA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Initials</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Roelofs</td>
<td>Wildlife</td>
<td>D.R.</td>
<td>02/04/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Gregory</td>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>R.G.</td>
<td>02/10/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela San Filippo</td>
<td>Fisheries</td>
<td>A.S.</td>
<td>2/9/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawn Simpson</td>
<td>Hydrology</td>
<td>S.S.</td>
<td>2/16/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ken Van Etten</td>
<td>Soil</td>
<td>K.V.E.</td>
<td>2/15/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia Wineteer</td>
<td>Botany/Noxious Weeds</td>
<td>M.W.</td>
<td>2/13/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean Williams</td>
<td>NEPA Compliance</td>
<td>J.W.</td>
<td>2/18/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Mason</td>
<td>Fuels</td>
<td>A.M.</td>
<td>2-18-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trish Lindaman</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>T.L.</td>
<td>2-19-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Osmanski</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>J.O.</td>
<td>2-18-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Refer to the Butte Falls Hazardous Fuels Reduction EA for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis.
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.

Al Mason
Project Lead

Jean Williams
NEPA Coordinator

Jon Raby
Field Manager
Butte Falls Resource Area

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.
Map 2. Pleasant Fry Underburning Unit 901UB