

Worksheet

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management

A. Background

BLM Office: Prineville District Office **NEPA Log #:** DOI-BLM-OR-P060-2012-0037-DNA

Location: Long Prairie Slough, LaPine Oregon.

Proposed Action Title: Long Prairie Slough Culvert Removal and Headcut Stabilization

Description of the Proposed Action:

An old road bed containing approximately 25 feet of 36" culvert has washed out along Long Prairie Slough. The channel has cut around the culvert and both the new channel and culvert have become clogged with debris. This has resulted in a marshy and ponded environment above the culvert which has become important habitat for Oregon Spotted Frogs. The goal of the project is to remove the washed out and plugged culvert while maintaining the ponded environment above the culvert.

In order to accomplish this, a small log jam will be created at the outlet of the pond utilizing an approximate 12 inch dbh lodge pole pine. The lodge pole will be tipped over utilizing a backhoe so that its root wad may be utilized within the project. The tree will then be cut into approximately 20 to 25 foot sections and a 15 foot bole will remain attached to the root wad. The jam will be constructed by burying the ends of the logs within the banks and anchoring them with large 1.5 to 2 foot diameter rocks, which will also be buried. The upstream end of the logjam will then be backfilled with sediment from the pond in order to mimic current conditions. Some Geo-Textile fabric may be used at the base of the logjam in order to prevent seepage from the base of the structure.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan Name: Upper Deschutes RMP

Date approved (ROD): Sept 2005

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 (objectives, terms, conditions):

in that it will "maintain, converse (protect), and restore aquatic and riparian dependent resources, including riparian vegetation and habitat diversity, to achieve healthy and productive

riparian areas and wetlands.... Manage for riparian habitats that support populations of well-distributed native and desired nonnative plant, vertebrate, and invertebrate populations similar to historic condition” (p. 34).

and “secure existing habitats that support the strongest populations of wide-ranging aquatic species. Securing can mean either reducing threats within the subwatershed or reducing threats in adjacent subwatersheds that could prevent achievement of subwatershed objectives (p 36).

and by “ensuring that water quality influenced by BLM activities a) achieves or is making significant progress toward achieving established BLM objectives for watershed function, and b) complies or is making progress toward achieving State of Oregon water quality standards for beneficial uses as established per stream by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality ” (p. 42).

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and related documents that cover the proposed action

The following NEPA documents cover the proposed action:

Headcut Stabilization EA –DOI-BLM-OR-P000-2011-0024-EA - January 2012

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 a feature of the selected alternative, alternative 2, within the Headcut Stabilization EA and is located within the same analysis area.

“One method of headcut stabilization would be the introduction of some large roughness elements into the stream channel, such as boulders or log jams. In many stream systems within the Pacific Northwest, large wood and boulders provide natural grade control in the form of channel spanning log jams or debris flow deposits.” (Headcut EA, p. 6)

“The project area for this EA encompasses all BLM managed stream corridors within the Prineville District.” (Headcut EA, p. 13)

A complete list of all project design features that will be employed for this project can be seen in the Headcut Stabilization EA (p. 8-12)

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 existing range of alternative was just concluded in January of 2012 and is still relevant to this project. During the timeframe between the completion of the Headcut Stabilization EA and this document, no new information or circumstances have occurred. It can be reasonably concluded that there are no new information or circumstances that would substantially change the range of alternatives that were analyzed for in the existing NEPA.

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 all new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

The existing analysis was just completed in January of 2012 and is still relevant to this project. During the timeframe between the completion of the Headcut Stabilization EA and this document, no new information or circumstances have occurred. It can be reasonably concluded that there are no new information or circumstances that would substantially change the analysis of the proposed action.

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 effects resulting for the implementation of the proposed project are similar to those analyzed in the Headcut Stabilization EA. These include:

“During construction activities, some bank and bed excavation may be necessary in order to key stabilization structures into the landscape and greatly reduce the probability of failure. These actions would likely result in increased sediment during construction and possibly immediately following the completion of the project.” (Headcut EA, p. 17)

and

“Disturbed lands would also be more susceptible to erosion during high flows after project implementation until riparian vegetation can become reestablished” (Headcut EA, p.17)

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA

document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Yes, the public involvement and interagency review that was incorporated into the development of the Headcut Stabilization EA is adequate for this project. Consultation with the public and other agencies occurred both in April of 2011 prior to the development of the EA and again in November of 2011 following the completion of the EA.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency represented</u>
Mike McKay	Hydrologist	Hydrology
James Eisner	Fish Biologist	Fisheries
Cassandra Hummel	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife/Botany
Ryan Griffin	Archeologist	Cultural Resources
JoAnne Armson	Botanist	Special Status Plants

Note: Refer to the EA for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

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 constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

Signature

Responsible official:


William D. Brown

Molly Brown

Deschutes Resource Area Field Manager

7/20/12
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.

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this review, contact: Mike McKay, Prineville Field Office, 3050 NE 3rd Street, Prineville, OR 97754, telephone (541) 416-6774, mmckay@blm.gov.

