

## **DECISION RECORD**

Douglas Creek Allotment Management Plan (AMP) Revision and Douglas Creek Canyon  
Restoration Environmental Assessment  
*DOI-BLM-OR-134-2014-0008*

Bureau of Land Management  
Wenatchee Field Office  
915 Walla Walla Avenue  
Wenatchee, Washington

### **1. Background**

In May 2014, a Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) conducted a land health evaluation and determination of land health standards for the Douglas Creek Watershed (analysis area) in Douglas County, Washington. The evaluation concluded that BLM-administered lands in the analysis area were meeting or making significant progress towards meeting most standards. However, it also identified portions of the action area where land health improvements could be made.

As a result of these findings, the IDT analyzed effects of measures to improve land health and watershed conditions on BLM-administered lands in the analysis area (action area), in the *Douglas Creek Allotment Management Plan (AMP) Revision and Douglas Creek Canyon Restoration Environmental Assessment (DOI-BLM-OR-134-2014-0008)*.

### **2. Decision**

It is my decision to implement the riparian restoration and weed treatment portions of the proposed action as described in Environmental Assessment (EA) DOI-BLM-OR-134-2014-0008. Implementation will include riparian restoration projects in Douglas Creek canyon including stream bank and water quality protection and dispersed camp area rehabilitation. Non-native species (weeds) would be treated in the Douglas Creek allotment and Douglas Creek canyon.

This decision record only implements Douglas Creek canyon riparian restoration and action area weed treatment portions of the proposed action analyzed in the EA. A separate decision has been developed for implementation of a revised allotment management plan (AMP) in the Douglas Creek allotment, available at the BLM Spokane District website: <http://www.blm.gov/or/districts/spokane/plans/index.php>.

### **3. Authority**

The BLM manages land health and watershed function as directed by the Spokane District Resource Management Plan and Federal Grazing Administration regulations (EA, Section 1.1). The Agricultural Risk Protection Act of 2000 (Public Law 106-224) authorizes the BLM to manage noxious weeds and to coordinate with other federal and

state agencies in activities to eradicate, suppress, control, prevent, or retard the spread of any noxious weeds on federal lands. The Federal Noxious Weed Act of 1974 directs federal agencies to control or contain undesirable plant species using methods including biological agents.

#### **4. Rationale**

The proposed action best meets the purpose and need through riparian restoration in Douglas Creek canyon and weed treatments in Douglas Creek canyon and Douglas Creek allotment (EA, Section 2).

The RMP ROD directs BLM to: a) preserve, protect, and restore natural functions in riparian and wetland areas (USDI BLM 1987, p. 19); and b) design vegetation management projects to improve wildlife habitat and to plant shrubs and control noxious weeds in the Douglas Creek Management Area (USDI BLM 1987, p. 20). The need for maintaining or improving riparian and upland health in the action area is to meet federal objectives for promoting healthy sustainable ecosystems (43 CFR 4100.0-2), as outlined in the Fundamentals of Rangeland Health (43 CFR 4180.1) and the Standards for Rangeland Health (BLM 1997).

Implementing the proposed action analyzed in the EA does not constitute a major federal action and will not lead to significant impacts to the human environment. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement is not required and will not be prepared.

#### **5. Scoping and Public Involvement**

On May 30, 2014 the BLM posted a scoping letter on its public NEPA website describing the proposed action and purpose and need for action, as well as notified the Colville Confederated Tribes and the Yakama Indian Nation and adjacent landowners including, The Nature Conservancy, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife. Colville Confederated Tribes asked that BLM add an appendix to the EA to clarify inadvertent discovery clauses for cultural resources and human remains in the event that previously unknown cultural materials are identified (EA p.80). No response was received from the Yakama Indian Nation.

#### **6. Coordination and Consultation**

A copy of the public scoping notice and cover letters were individually addressed and sent to the tribal Chairs, as well as the Cultural Resources Program managers and Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs) of the Colville Confederated Tribes and the Yakama Indian Nation. Formal National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 consultations were initiated with the Washington State Department of Archaeology & Historic Preservation (DAHP), the Colville Confederated Tribes and the Yakama Indian Nation. The DAHP concurred with the Area of Potential Effect and with a determination of no adverse effect to cultural resources, provided that site protection and archaeological

monitoring takes place as recommended. No response was received from tribes contacted.

## **7. Protest and Appeal**

This decision may be appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of the Secretary, in accordance with the regulations contained in 43 CFR, Part 4. To appeal you must file a notice of appeal at the BLM Wenatchee Field Office, 915 N. Walla Walla Ave., Wenatchee, Washington 98801, within 30 days from receipt of this decision. The appeal must be in writing and delivered in person, via the United States Postal Service mail system, or other common carrier, to the Wenatchee Field Office as noted above. The BLM does not accept appeals by facsimile or email. The appellant has the burden of showing that the decision appealed from is in error.

If you wish to file a petition pursuant to regulation 43 CFR 4.21 (58 FR 4939, January 19, 1993) for a stay of the effectiveness of this decision during the time that your appeal is being reviewed by the Board, the petition for a stay must accompany your notice of appeal. Except as otherwise provided by law or other pertinent regulation, a petition for a stay of decision pending appeal shall show sufficient justification based on the following standards: (a) The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied, (b) The likelihood of the appellant's success on the merits, (c) The likelihood of immediate and irreparable harm if the stay is not granted, and (d) Whether the public interest favors granting the stay.

Copies of the notice of appeal and petition for a stay must also be submitted to each party named in this decision and to the Interior Board of Land Appeals and to the Office of the Solicitor (see 43 CFR 4.413); Regional Solicitor, Pacific Northwest Region, U.S. Department of the Interior, 805 SW Broadway, Suite 600, Portland, OR 97205; at the same time the original documents are filed with this office.

/s/ Linda Coates-Markle

3-17-2015

\_\_\_\_\_  
Linda Coates-Markle  
Field Manager

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date