

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

A. Background

Name of Proposed Action: Native Hardwood Planting – North Fk. & South Fk. Crooked Rivers

DNA Number: DOI-BLM-OR-P040-2012-0034-DNA

Location of Proposed Action: Eleven miles northeast of Post, Oregon; five miles southwest of Paulina, Oregon.

Description of the Proposed Action: The proposed action is to plant 20-50 rooted (4 inch x 16 inch tubes) and unrooted local native cottonwood cuttings in the riparian area of the North Fork Crooked River, adjacent to the 4215 in the Lookout Pasture, and the South Fork Crooked River.

This would be a 1 day project in April or early May, 2012, after peak runoff.\

Planting would use a shovel or digging bar within 50ft. of the active channel bank. Trees/cuttings would be planted 2-3 ft deep. Most of them would be hidden by the cut bank, and the trees would be temporarily caged using 4 inch x 3 ft plastic tubes or plastic vexar netting. Survival would be monitored in mid-summer, and if materials are available, surviving trees would be caged with wire cages and t-posts.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan:

Brothers/La Pine Resource Management Plan (RMP) (ROD): July 1989.

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable plan even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following land use plan decisions:

Page 98: Management actions within riparian areas will include measures to protect or restore natural functions,, as defined by Executive Orders 11988 and 11990 and the Oregon-Washington Riparian Enhancement Plan (1987).

The Oregon/Washington Riparian Enhancement Plan 1987 provides overall guidance and direction for management of riparian areas within the planning area. The overall goal of this plan is to maintain, restore, or improve riparian areas to achieve a healthy and productive ecological condition for maximum long-term multiple use benefits and values.

Page 86: Stream riparian areas will continue to be protected and managed to provide full vegetative potential.

C. Applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document and related documents to the Proposed Action

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

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 not specifically analyzed in the existing NEPA document as it was assumed restoration of riparian areas would occur naturally through livestock grazing management (pg. 87 FEIS). However, the FEIS states that “additional vegetative manipulations will be conducted to improve watershed conditions which will increase late season water availability in streams”.

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, and resource values?

Yes, the range of alternatives varied from Commodity Production and Enhancement of Economic Benefits to Emphasizing Natural Values. The current proposed action of planting native hardwoods fall well within the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, and updated lists of BLM sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

New information highlights the need to restore riparian area conditions and fish habitat as outlined in Native Fish Habitat Restoration Program and national and state directives to improve watershed function and ecological conditions. The existing NEPA is still relevant as the analysis concludes that vegetative manipulation will need to be conducted to improve watershed condition.

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(s)?

Yes, the same effects that would result from the proposed action were analyzed in the Brothers LaPine DEIS (pg. 91 & 92).

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

Yes, the list of “interested publics” is updated on a regular basis and many of the individuals and organizations on the current “interested publics” list are the same as those on the mailing list for the planning and NEPA documents listed. In addition, this DNA will be posted to the web to make it available to any additional publics not previously involved.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Title</u> | <u>Resource Represented</u> |
|------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| JoAnne Armson | Biological Science Technician | Botany, Special Status Plants |
| Rick Demmer | Wildlife Biologist | Wildlife |
| Terry Holtzapple | Archeologist | Cultural Resources |
| Jeff Moss | Fisheries Biologist | Fisheries |
| Teal Purrington | Planning and Environmental Coordinator | NEPA Compliance |
| Michelle McSwain | Assistant Field Manager, DRA | Management |

Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

Signature

Responsible Official: H.F. "Chip" Faver
H.F. "Chip" Faver, Resource Area Field Manager

4-8-12
Date

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.

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this review, contact: Michelle McSwain, Prineville Field Office, 3050 NE 3rd Street, Prineville, OR 97754, 541-416-6877, mmcswain@blm.gov.