

**Livestock Stream-Crossing Construction  
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

South River Field Office  
EA# OR-105-07-08

Date Prepared: June 22, 2007

“Draft”

**Finding of No Significant Impact**

The Roseburg District, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), South River Field Office has completed the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Livestock Stream-Crossing Construction project. Two alternatives were analyzed consisting of Alternative One - No Action, and Alternative Two – The Proposed Action, described in Chapter Two of the EA (p. 3).

The following Critical Elements of the Human Environment are not relevant because they are not present in the project areas and would not be affected: Wild and Scenic Rivers; Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC); Visual Resources; Wilderness; Wastes, Hazardous or Solid.

The following Critical Elements of the Human Environment would not be affected by the proposed stream-crossing construction: Air Quality; Prime of Unique Farmlands; Wetlands; Water Quality. No unique characteristics would be impacted, as described in Council on Environmental Regulations contained in the Code of Federal Regulations at 40 CFR § 1508.27(b)(3)

The proposed project is consistent with Executive Order 12898 which addresses Environmental Justice in minority and low-income populations. There would be no impacts to low-income or minority populations that have been identified by the BLM internally or through the public involvement process. Contractors employed on the project would come from local communities.

There are no known religious concerns or values associated with the project area, so there would be no anticipated effects on Native American Religious Concerns. (40 CFR § 1508.27 (b)(8)).

Section 106 responsibilities under the National Historic Preservation Act have been completed by the BLM in accordance with the 1998 Oregon State Historic Preservation Office protocols. A pedestrian survey of the project sites did not identify any extant cultural or historical resources that would be affected so there would be no impacts to scientific, cultural, or historical resources. (40 CFR § 1508.27 (b)(8))

There are no terrestrial wildlife or plant species present in the immediate vicinity of the project areas that are listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act, nor would the proposed action remove or modify suitable habitat for any listed species.

Norton Creek, Olalla Creek and Fate Creek all provide spawning and rearing habitat for the Oregon Coast coho salmon, and are consequently designated as Essential Fish Habitat under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1996. Implementation of the proposed action would improve the quality of Essential Fish Habitat in and downstream of the project areas. Re-establishment of trees will provide shade and a source of large wood for in-stream recruitment in the long term. Re-vegetation of disturbed and eroded streamside areas will reduce sedimentation. Combined, these factors will increase the productivity of macro-invertebrate populations that provide prey for fish, and increase the quality of rearing habitat for juvenile fish. This project would not have any significant adverse impacts to Essential Fish Habitat, within the context of 40 CFR § 1508.27(b)(9).

The proposed bridge installation is consistent with applicable Federal, State, and local laws (40 CFR § 1508.27(b)(10)).

Of the twelve points listed under 40 CFR § 1508.27(b), the following were considered and found not to apply to the proposed action: significant beneficial or adverse effects; significant effects on public health or safety; effects on the quality of the human environment that are likely to be highly controversial; anticipated cumulatively significant impacts; highly uncertain or unknown risks; and no precedents for future actions with significant effects.

Based on the analysis of potential impacts contained in the EA, I have determined that the proposed action will not have 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 EIS is not required.

---

Ralph Thomas  
Field Manager  
South River Field Office

---

Date