

DECISION RECORD & CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION REVIEW

Project Name: Woodrat Mt. Hang-gliding RVHPA. (DOI-BLM-OR-M060-2009-023-CX)

BLM Office: Ashland R.A., Medford District. Phone # (541) 618-2369

DESCRIPTION & LOCATION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION:

The Rogue Valley Hanggliding and Paragliders Association (RVHPA) have submitted a Special Recreation Permit application to hold a 2009, non-competitive fly-in and social. The RVHPA expects 100-120 participants for this event. The purpose of this action is to issue a Special Recreation Use Permit for a non-competitive fly-in-social event at Woodrat Mountain.

The Woodrat Mountain site is recognized as a recreation site in the 1995 Medford District RMP. This site has served as the primary takeoff site for hanggliders and paragliders in the Applegate Valley for over 30 years. Long-term permission has been established by the RVHPA to use on offsite landing zone. In the event brochure created by the RVHPA, two landing zones have been identified in a map along with hazards and areas where gliders should not land.

This permit requires use of the Bishop Creek Road 38-3-23 and the established parking area at the take off site. Temporary restroom facilities would be placed on site by RVHPA to adequately accommodate the users during the course of the event. All material and refuse would be removed from the site at the conclusion of the event.

In the *Code of Federal Regulations Public Lands: Interior 43 Part § 2932.11* Permits Required. Special Recreation Permits are required for commercial or competitive use involving more than one mile of public lands or shoreline.

PLAN CONFORMANCE

This recreation proposal is in conformance with the Medford District's 2008 Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan (USDI 2008). This project involves use of existing facilities and complies with the Management Objectives and Direction of the 2008 Resource Management Plan. In addition, this project fully complies with the management objectives, action, and direction of the resource management plan in place prior to the 2008 RMP, the 1995 RMP. The design of this project would not have differed under either plan. This recreation proposal is also in compliance with the direction given for the management of public lands in the Medford District by the Oregon and California Lands Act of 1937 (O&C Act), Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, the Clean Water Act of 1987, Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974 (as amended 1986 and 1996), Clean Air Act, and the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979.

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION REVIEW

The proposed action would not create adverse environmental effects under the categorical exclusion exceptions, unless as noted. The proposed action will:

- | <u>Yes</u> | <u>No</u> | <u>Categorical Exclusion Exception</u> |
|------------|-----------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| () | (X) | 1. Have significant adverse effects on public health or safety. |
| () | (X) | 2. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resource; park, recreation, or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas. |
| () | (X) | 3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)] not already |

- decided in an approved land use plan.
- () (X) 4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or unique or unknown environmental risks.
- () (X) 5. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects.
- () (X) 6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but significant cumulative environmental effects. (40 CFR 1508.7 and 1508.25(a)).
- () (X) 7. Have adverse effects on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.
- () (X) 8. Have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species.
- () (X) 9. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.
- () (X) 10. Have disproportionate significant adverse impacts on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898).
- () (X) 11. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007).
- () (X) 12. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or nonnative invasive species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112).

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS


The proposed action has been reviewed against the twelve criteria listed above for an exception to a categorical exclusion and does not fall under any exception as identified in 516 DM 2, Appendix 2. The project qualifies as a categorical exclusion under 516 DM 11.9 H (1).

<u>Dennis Byrd</u>	<u>Outdoor Recreation Planner</u>	<u>March 1, 2009</u>
Prepared by	Title	Date

<u>Kristi Mastrofina</u>	<u>Environmental Coordinator</u>	<u>May 1, 2009</u>
Reviewed/Edited by	Title	Date

DECISION

Based on the NEPA CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION REVIEW above, I have determined that the proposed action qualifies as a categorical exclusion under 516 DM 11.9 H (1) involves no significant impact to the human environment and that no further environmental analysis is required.


 John Gerritsma
 Field Manager, Ashland Resource Area

5/21/09
 Date