

Prineville District
**Land Use Plan Conformance and
Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**
Review and Approval

Name of Proposed Action: Alfalfa Market Area Trailhead Construction and Implementation of Motor Vehicle Closure

DNA Number: OR-056-08-148

Location of Proposed Action:

Trailhead: Township 17 S, Range R 14 E, Section 27 SE $\frac{1}{4}$ of SE $\frac{1}{4}$, and Section 32 NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of NE $\frac{1}{4}$.
Motor Vehicle Closure: T 17 S, Range 13 & 14 E. Generally South of Alfalfa Market Road, East of Bennett Road, North and West of Dodds Road.

Purpose of and Need for Action: To provide a designated trailhead to enhance visitors' experience, protect resources, provide for visitor safety by providing off street parking, and minimize conflicts with adjacent landowners. This project would also implement a motor vehicle closure on the described lands, as directed in the Upper Deschutes Resource management Plan (UDRMP). Currently, activities such as, off-highway vehicle use, illegal dumping, abandoning of vehicles, illegal wood cutting, and transient camping, are negatively impacting the recreational experience as directed in the UDRMP and the environmental condition of the area.

Description of the Proposed Action:

Walker Road Trailhead: A combination barbed and smooth wire fence (following wildlife spacing guidelines) would be constructed to clearly define the parking area. A 12 foot locking gate would be installed across Walker Road to allow emergency vehicles, grazing permittees, and utility company access. A second 3-4 foot walk through gate would allow hikers, bikers, and horse access from the parking area to the trail network. The existing kiosk on Alfalfa Market Road would be relocated to this trailhead location. Roadside signs would be installed directing traffic from Alfalfa Market and Dodds Road to the trailhead on Walker Road.

Motor vehicle closure: The two access roads heading south from Alfalfa Market Road would be blocked with a rock crib in the center of the existing roads. A combination barbed and smooth wire fence (following wildlife spacing specifications) would be installed from the rock cribs to the existing fenceline. The area with the existing kiosk will have a 3-4 foot walk through gate to allow hikers, bikers, and horse access from Alfalfa Market Road. The road here will be rehabilitated and converted to a trail. The other access at mile post 5 from Alfalfa Market Road would be obliterated beyond the line of sight from the road to send the clear message that the route is closed. Any other current routes accessing the area would need to be gated and/or fenced depending on permittee, utility, and canal access needs.

Trail Network: With input from area users a designated trail network would be established by converting the current routes into trails. Unnecessary routes would be obliterated and rehabilitated. Some new trails may be constructed to connect trails and to provide an adequate, looping trail network.

Plan Conformance:

The above project has been reviewed and found to be in conformance with the following BLM plan:

Upper Deschutes RMP/Final EIS, 2005

Upper Deschutes Resource Management Plan/Record of Decision 2005 (UDRMP) Pages 102-111, 121-122

The proposed action is in conformance with the UDRMP because it is clearly consistent with the following UDRMP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions) and implementation plan decisions:

Objective R-1: Provide and maintain a wide range of recreation opportunities and resource management objectives within the planning area and urban interface setting.

Guideline 1: Areas designated **Non-motorized recreation exclusive** will be managed to promote non-motorized recreation uses. Trails and facilities in these areas will be designed and managed for non-motorized trail use. These areas are designated closed to motorized use except for use of public roads and rights-of-way, or roads that access recreation facilities, trailheads, etc.

Guideline 7: The Upper Deschutes RMP will serve as a recreation management plan or will allow the completion of the following required elements of a Special Recreation Area management plan:

b. Designated access points, staging areas, trailheads, parking areas, day use sites, campgrounds, and other site facilities.

c. A specific trail system layout that includes shared use trails or user-specific trails as dictated by the RMP. Designated trail system layouts will include segments to be closed, segments to retain as is or improve, and new segments to be constructed to make a useable system.

Objective R-2: Provide designated access points (includes entry points, parking areas, trailheads, and/or staging areas) to enhance visitor experience, protect resources, and minimize conflicts with adjacent landowners.

Guideline 1: Provide safe access from public roadways to public lands at locations and distributions appropriate to overall management. Prioritize access points from public roadways as follows:

a. Paved public roads that are not Expressways (includes county major and minor arterials) are used as a first priority.

Guideline 3: General public access points will be limited to the minimum necessary to meet recreation and other management objectives.

Guideline 4: Motorized access points not needed or selected for designation/development, but required for other uses (e.g. utility access, grazing access, and other occasional administrative access), may not be open to the public.

Guideline 5: Designate new or move existing access points, when feasible, away from private property boundaries.

Guideline 6: Access to public lands, particularly for full-size vehicles, will be limited within several miles

of urban growth boundaries, especially access from high volume state highways or paved county roads. Existing rights-of-ways may be used as primary public access.

Guideline 8: Mark access points and managed parking areas with physical barriers that define the area.

Guideline 9: Consider range of the developments at designated access points depending upon projected use levels, that include but are not limited to:

- a. Trailheads utilized by equestrians and OHV users should be large enough to accommodate vehicles pulling trailers and designed to minimize or eliminated the need to back a trailer.
- b. Informational and regulatory signs
- c. Sanitary facilities
- d. Site hardening for parking or staging areas.

Guideline 10: Road and trail maps will not, where practicable, show unauthorized access across private lands.

Objective R-3: Manage off highway motorized vehicle use on BLM administered land to provide visitor satisfaction, protect natural resources, provide visitor safety, minimize conflicts among public land visitors and adjacent land owners and integrate opportunities with adjacent land management agencies.

Guideline 3: Roads closed to motorized travel by the public may be retained if needed for administrative or public safety purposes.

Guideline 12: Cattle guards will be placed where designated trails cross fences. Gates will be installed next to cattle guards to accommodate recreational horse use and other uses.

Guideline 17: Public use information will be available at key points including all trailheads and staging areas. These locations will have bulletin boards that display information about motorized and non-motorized trail riding, natural history, resource protection, and how to avoid private lands.

25. In areas designated Closed to motor vehicle use and outside WSAs, existing road rights of way that are open to general public use and provide access to residential areas (i.e., more than a single residence) or connections to other public roads may remain open as part of the interim management of existing roads and trails until a final road and trail system is designated.

Objective R – 4: Provide identifiable non-motorized recreation opportunities to provide visitor satisfaction, protect natural resources, and minimize conflicts among public land visitors and adjacent land owners.

Guideline 1: When consistent with plan objectives convert non-designated roads and old travel ways to trails for such activities as horseback riding, running, or mountain biking. When possible, rehabilitate these roads to differentiate them from designated roads that occur in the same area and reduce the unintended use of these routes by full size vehicles.

Guideline 2: Incorporate BLM administered non-motorized trails into regional trail networks when consistent with other resource management goals.

Guideline 6: Close redundant trails.

Guideline 7: Rehabilitate or repair trails that are unsafe or contribute to erosion.

Guideline 8: Design trail routes that avoid private property or obtain easements from willing landowner if avoidance is difficult or expensive.

Guideline 9: Reroute roads and trails that cross private property to create road and trail loops that are exclusively on BLM administered lands to allow continued recreation use and authorization of SRPs for events that do not require private landowner approval.

Objective R - 6: Provide developed or urban based recreation opportunities while minimizing duplication of services among agencies. Provide improvements that allow for easier pedestrian

access and encourage day use and interpretive activities while minimizing conflicts with adjacent landowners where practicable.

Mayfield Pond Recreation Area

The Mayfield Pond area will be managed to provide separate geographic areas for motorized and non-motorized use, with most of the area south of Alfalfa Market Road being managed exclusively for non-motorized trail use, and the area to the north of Alfalfa Market Road being managed for motorized use on a designated road system.

Objective R – 2: Provide designated access points (includes entry points, parking areas, trailheads, and/or staging areas) to enhance visitor experience, protect resources, and minimize conflicts with adjacent landowners.

Guideline 2: Provide designated entry points and trailheads that support trail use in the Mayfield Pond block.

a. Accommodate horse trailers.

b. Minimize the spread or expansion of user created parking areas.

Guideline 5: Consider providing new designated access to the area south of Alfalfa Market Road from Dodds Road.

Guideline 8: Access controls will be made to support the motorized vehicle closure south of Alfalfa Market Road (e.g., fences, signs, barriers, etc.).

Guideline 9: Provide a parking area/trailhead for the closed area south of Alfalfa Market Road, to allow for parking. Day use improvements such as picnic tables, group use areas, etc. may be considered. Other access points may be provided to serve surrounding residential access, but will be minor access gates, without improved parking.

Objective R – 3: Manage off highway motorized vehicle use on BLM administered land to provide visitor satisfaction, protect natural resources, provide visitor safety, minimize conflicts among public land visitors and adjacent land owners and integrate opportunities with adjacent land management agencies.

Allocations/Allowable Uses:

1. See RMP Maps 3 and 16 for Travel Management Allowable Uses within the Mayfield Pond Recreation Area.

Objective R – 4: Provide identifiable non-motorized recreation opportunities to provide visitor satisfaction, protect natural resources, and minimize conflicts among public land visitors and adjacent land owners.

Allocations/Allowable Uses:

1. Non-motorized use south of Alfalfa Market Road and west of Dodds Road (except hiking) will be limited to designated roads and trails when a designated system is implemented.

Guideline 2: The Mayfield Pond area south of Alfalfa Market Road and north of Dodds Road, and the Airport Allotment is designated as Non-motorized Recreation Exclusive (Recreation Emphasis) and will be managed for non-motorized trail use. Trails in the area will provide several different length loops for hiking, running, equestrian and mountain bike use.

Guideline 3: Manage non-motorized use by developing a designated, signed, non-motorized trail system in the following areas:

b. BLM land south of Alfalfa Market Road and west and north of Dodds Road.

Guideline 8: Where possible, roads will be converted to trails.

Applicable NEPA document and related documents:

The following NEPA documents and related documents address the proposed action:

Upper Deschutes Resource Management Plan, Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) (2005)

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 UDRMP/FEIS (2005) analyzed the effects of closing motor vehicle access into the project area on page 121. The plan also analyzed providing designated access points and a designated trail system to enhance visitor experience, protect resources, and minimize conflicts with adjacent landowners. The proposed location of the trailhead has been changed by this proposal from the original trailhead location identified by Objective R-4, Guideline 5. The new location off of Walker road was selected to mitigate problems with visitor safety, to mitigate impacts to adjacent private lands, and through further public input

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 the alternatives in the UDRMP/FEIS adequately addresses current issues and concerns. The proposed project provides for continued public access to BLM managed public lands from public roads, while closing the land to motorized vehicle use.

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?

Given the recent development and adoption of the UDRMP, ROD (2005) the existing analysis and conclusions are adequate in light of current conditions and information.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?

Yes. The methodology and approach used in the UDRMP continues to be appropriate for the current proposed action. Consideration was given to the natural resource values and the adjacent residential setting in developing allocations for travel management, wildlife habitat emphasis, and public lands user's recreation needs.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

The project will include survey for archeological, botanical, and wildlife resources to ensure that the effects continue to be unchanged or are in need of mitigation. The UDRMP sufficiently analyzed the impacts of closing the area to motor vehicles, constructing a trailhead, and creating a designated trail system on a site specific basis for the Mayfield Pond Recreation Area.

6. Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

The cumulative impacts arising from the implementation of the motorized vehicle closure were fully addressed in the UDRMP, which identified the project area as closed to motorized vehicles.

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

Extensive public involvement and interdisciplinary review was completed during the UDRMP process. With further input from local residents and advice from the interdisciplinary team, the trailhead location has been altered as described in Question 1.

Interdisciplinary Analysis:

The following BLM staff participated in the preparation of this document.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Resource Represented (or title)</u>
Brooke Anderson	Range Management Specialist
Ariel Hiller	Recreation Technician
Jim Beaupre	Interim Recreation Planner
Gavin Hoban	Resource Area Specialist
Bill Dean	Wildlife Biologist
Ron Halvorson	Botany
Ron Gregory	Archaeologist
Janet Hutchison	Lands
Dana Cork	Engineer
Teal Purrington	NEPA

Mitigation Measures:

The following mitigation measures will be implemented as part of the proposed action:

Should threatened, endangered, or other special status plant or animal species be found by BLM personnel or the public prior to or during project implementation, the project would either be implemented as proposed, modified or dropped from further consideration based on the level of importance of the species involved. Individual sites would be identified on the ground with flagging and/or paint and would be excluded from the project area or the season of implementation would be modified to eliminate adverse impacts to the identified species.

Any human remains, cultural, and/or paleontological resources (historic or prehistoric or vertebrate fossil site or object) that are discovered as a result of project implementation shall immediately be reported by

suspended until written notification is issued by the authorized officer. An evaluation of the discovery will be made by the authorized officer, in consultation with a qualified cultural resources specialist, to determine appropriate actions to prevent the loss of significant cultural or scientific values.

Approval:

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 NEPA. The proposed action and any specified mitigation measure(s) has been determined to meet the criteria for a Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA). No additional environmental analysis required. The cultural specialist and the T&E plant and wildlife specialists have provided clearances for the proposed project.

Approved By: *William De...* *Acting for Molly Brown* Date *10/21/08*
Molly Brown, Deschutes Resource Area Field Manager

Note: The signature on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and cannot be appealed.