

# White Castle Temporary Area Closure Environmental Assessment

DOI-BLM-OR-R050-2013-0007-EA

South River Field Office, Roseburg District

## “Draft” Finding of No Significant Impact

### Overview

The White Castle Temporary Area Closure applies management direction from the 1995 Roseburg District *Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan* (ROD/RMP), which is tiered to the 1994 Roseburg District *Proposed Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact statement* (PRMP/EIS). The White Castle Temporary Area Closure Environmental Assessment (EA) considered two alternatives, No Action and the Proposed Action.

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM), South River Field Office would implement the 2,167-acre White Castle Temporary Area Closure for up to 24 months in the following locations:

S½ SE¼ Section 23, Section 25, and NE¼ Section 26, T. 28 S. R 3 W., Willamette Meridian (W.M.)  
E½ Section 4, NE¼ W½ Section 4, N½ Section 31, Section 32, and SW¼, and Section 33, T. 28 S. R 2  
W., W.M.

The temporary area closure would minimize user conflicts during implementation of the White Castle Variable Retention Harvest Project which was analyzed in the Roseburg Secretarial Demonstration Project Environmental Assessment (Pilot EA, DOI-BLM-OR-R050-2011-0006-EA).

Both context and intensity must be considered in determining significance of the environmental effects of agency action (40 CFR 1508.27):

### Context

The White Castle Temporary Closure Area is set within the Myrtle Creek, Little River, and Middle South Umpqua/Dumont Creek watershed analysis units. Total forested Federal ownership (BLM and U.S. Forest Service) in the watersheds is approximately 211,000 acres (Pilot EA, Table 3-2, p. 35), with approximately 56,700 acres of this total under BLM administration (Pilot EA, Table 3-3, p. 35).

The restricted area would affect approximately one percent of all Federal forests in the watersheds, and four percent of forested lands under BLM administration in the watersheds. As such, the proposed action does not bear any regional, statewide, national or international importance.

## Intensity

The Council on Environmental Quality includes the following ten considerations for evaluating intensity.

1. *Has significant impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (1))?*

Any impacts would be consistent with the range and scope of effects described and analyzed in the 1994 *Final Roseburg District Proposed Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement* (1994 PRMP/ EIS). The action is limited in scope and duration and would have no effects on natural resources (EA, p. 7).

2. *Has significant adverse impacts on public health or safety (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (2))?*

The primary purpose of the proposed action is to minimize user conflicts and address safety concerns during implementation of the White Castle Variable Retention Harvest Project. The physical setting is in a forested rural area removed from any municipalities and residential properties. The proposed action would not have adverse impacts on public health and 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))?*

Unique geographic characteristics (such as those listed above) are absent from the action area and would not be affected. No ground disturbing activities would occur. Therefore, there would be no effect to any cultural or historic resources.

4. *Has highly controversial effects on the quality of the human environment (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (4))?*

The BLM has implemented area closures to address safety concerns and user conflicts in other locations across western Oregon. Given that this is a temporary closure limited in its areal extent, the BLM has concluded that effects would not be highly controversial. There is no scientific controversy pertaining to the effects of the action on the environment.

5. *Has highly uncertain or involves unique or unknown risks to the human environment (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (5))?*

The BLM has implemented area closures to address safety concerns and user conflicts in other locations across western Oregon. Given that this is a temporary closure limited in its areal extent, the BLM has concluded that effects would not result in unique or unknown risks to the human environment.

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))?*

The use of temporary area closures to minimize user conflicts and address safety concerns is a well-established practice. This proposed action does not represent any decision in principle about future considerations which would be subject to site-specific evaluation and analysis.

7. *Is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (7))?*

The White Castle Temporary Area Closure would have no direct or indirect impacts on natural resources; therefore there would be no cumulative impacts to those resources. There are currently no other proposed area closures on the Roseburg District, therefore Alternative 2 would have no cumulative effects on recreation resources.

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))?*

The proposed temporary area closure would not result in any ground disturbance nor allow for present and future activities that may affect historic properties. Therefore, no cultural resource inventory is required as stated in the 1998 Protocol, Appendix E. The BLM has met its Section 106 requirements as guided by the Protocol and 2012 National Programmatic Agreement.

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))?*

The proposed action was determined to have no effect on federally listed threatened or endangered species or their habitat, therefore consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service is not required (EA, p. 9). There would be no modification or removal of northern spotted owl habitat. The action presents no circumstances that would affect water quality or Oregon Coast coho salmon habitat. No listed botanical species are known to occur in the area and the proposed action would not result in any ground disturbance with a potential to affect any unidentified populations.

10. *Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment (40 CFR 1508.27(b) (10))?*

The proposed action was designed in conformance with management direction from the Roseburg District *Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan (ROD/RMP)*, which itself is in conformance with all applicable laws and regulations. With respect to environmental justice, the proposed action would be consistent with Executive Order 12898 which addresses Environmental Justice. No potential impacts to low-income or minority populations have been identified.

Based on the analysis of potential impacts contained in the environmental assessment, I have determined that the White Castle Temporary Area Closure would have no significant impact on the human environment within the meaning of Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and that preparing an environmental impact statement is not required. I have determined that the effects of the area closure are within those anticipated and already analyzed in the 1994 PRMP/EIS. Therefore, the White Castle Temporary Area Closure is in conformance with the 1995 ROD/RMP approved by the Oregon/Washington State Director on June 2, 1995.



Steven Lydick, Field Manager  
South River Field Office  
Roseburg District BLM

7/30/2013

Date