

DRAFT Finding of No Significant Impacts (FONSI)

Roseburg District Aquatic Restoration

Roseburg District
Bureau of Land Management
Environmental Assessment
#OR-103-08-09

Date Prepared: July 29, 2009

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Roseburg District Office proposes a suite of programmatic actions targeted at restoring aquatic habitat throughout the district (EA, pp. 9-21). The Aquatic Restoration EA is programmatic in nature, and analyzes the effects of watershed restoration activities within the Roseburg District based upon years of professional experience and review of available literature. Because the analysis is broad-scale in nature and covers a variety of restoration actions, the EA does not list all discrete, site-specific proposed actions that may occur. The programmatic analysis limits the amount of site-specific detail within the analysis, instead relying on project design features to reduce or avoid impacts to different resources.

The analysis provides assumptions regarding the annual maximum of each type of restoration project that could be completed each year both district-wide and for any single 5th field watershed (pp. 9-12). Additionally, the proposed actions would be scattered throughout the Roseburg District.

Test for Significant Impacts.

1. Has significant impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (1))?
 Yes No

Remarks: The proposed action would positively impact aquatic resources by addressing degraded components of healthy aquatic and riparian systems (Aquatic Restoration EA, p. 5). Effects to other resources would be localized and mitigated through use of the appropriate project design features (EA, pp. 15-19). Furthermore, the proposed actions would occur on a small scale at locations scattered throughout the District; therefore, impacts to the affected human environment would not be significant.

2. Has significant adverse impacts on public health or safety (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (2))?
 Yes No

Remarks: There is no mechanism for the proposed action to adversely impact public health or safety.

3. Adversely effects such unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources, park, recreation or refuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers, sole or principal drinking water aquifers, prime farmlands, wetlands, floodplains or ecologically significant or critical areas including those listed on the Department's National Register of Natural Landmarks (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (3))?
 Yes No

Remarks: As stated in Chapters One and Two of the EA, each project location would be inventoried for unique geographic features (such as those described above). The presence of unique geographic features would be documented on a project by project basis and discussed as needed in project-specific decisions.

4. Has highly controversial effects on the quality of the human environment (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (4))?
 Yes No

Remarks: The BLM conducts aquatic restoration projects on a regular basis. Effects are expected to be consistent with those documented in the FEIS and literature cited in the EA; therefore, effects are not expected to be highly controversial.

5. Has highly uncertain or involves unique or unknown risks to the human environment (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (5))?
 Yes No

Remarks: The risks to the human environment from the project were analyzed in the Roseburg District Aquatic Restoration EA and found not to be highly uncertain or unique.

6. Establishes a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (6))?
 Yes No

Remarks: The proposed action is consistent with the management direction provided in the Roseburg District 1995 Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan (ROD/RMP) and therefore does not represent a decision in principle about a future consideration.

7. Is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (7))?
 Yes No

Remarks: The impacts to watershed health (pp. 26-30), water quality (pp. 30-32), fisheries (p. 32-34) and wildlife (pp. 34-47) were analyzed in the *Roseburg District Aquatic Restoration EA*. After review of the document and the analysis therein, these impacts are found not to be significant due to the diffuse nature of the projects scattered throughout the District.

8. Has adverse effects on districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (8))?
 Yes No

Remarks: As stated in Chapters One and Two of the EA, the BLM would conduct pre-project inventories and implement necessary mitigation measures to ensure compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act under the guidance of the 1997 National Programmatic Agreement and the 1998 Oregon Protocol. Compliance

with Section 106 and/or the presence of other unique geographic features would be documented on a project by project basis and discussed as needed in project-specific decisions.

9. May adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (40 CFR §1508.27(b)(9))?

Botanical Species	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Fish Species	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Wildlife Species	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Remarks: As described in Chapters One and Two of the EA, each project-specific location would be evaluated for the presence of federally listed species, their suitable habitat and their Critical Habitat. Project design features (pp. 15-19) would be employed as appropriate to minimize or avoid impacts to federally listed species.

If Kincaid's lupine were found at a project-specific location, use of PDF #54 (p. 19) would modify the project to avoid impacts to the species; therefore, the proposed actions would have no effect on listed botanical species

Programmatic consultation with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service for aquatic and riparian habitat restoration was completed in 2007. This consultation covers most of the proposed actions within this EA, and provides extensive project design features to be used in aquatic restoration projects. A Letter of Concurrence was received on June 14, 2007 (TAILS# 13420-2007-F-0055) that concurred with the BLMs conclusion that the suite of proposed actions *may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect* the northern spotted owl, marbled murrelet or their Critical Habitats.

Programmatic consultation was also completed with the National Marine Fisheries Service in 2007. This consultation covers most of the proposed actions within this EA, and provides extensive project design features to be used in aquatic restoration projects. A final supplemental Letter of Concurrence was received on June 27, 2008 (NMFS Nos. #2008/03507) that concurred with the BLMs conclusion that the suite of proposed actions *may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect* Oregon Coast coho salmon.

Should the BLM propose projects beyond those considered in either of the aforementioned programmatic consultation packages, consultation would be needed and the results of consultation would be disclosed in the project specific-decisions.

10. Threatens to violate Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment (40 CFR §1508.27(b)(10))?

Yes No

Remarks: The proposed action was designed in conformance with the management direction from the ROD/RMP which is in compliance with applicable laws. Conformance to the land use plan ensures compliance with all applicable Federal, State and local laws.

Based on the analysis of potential impacts contained in the environmental assessment, I have determined that Roseburg District Aquatic Restoration would not have a significant

impact on the human environment within the meaning of Section 102(2) (c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and that an environmental impact statement is not required. I have determined that the proposed action would be in conformance with the *Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan* (ROD/RMP) for the Roseburg District, approved by the Oregon/Washington State Director on June 2, 1995.

Jay Carlson
Roseburg District Manager

Date