

Worksheet
Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
(OR090-DNA-03-02)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

Note: This worksheet is to be completed consistent with the policies stated in the Instruction Memorandum entitled ADocumentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Adequacy@ transmitting this worksheet and the AGuidelines for Using the DNA Worksheet@ located at the end of the worksheet. (Note: The signed CONCLUSION at the end of this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM=s internal analysis process and does not constitute an appealable decision.)

A. BLM Office: Siuslaw Resource Area **Case/Serial/Case File No.** _n/a

Proposed Action Title/Type: Siuslaw fire road repair and rehab

Location of Proposed Action: T. 18 S., R. 8 W., Section 27

Description of the Proposed Action: Repair and rehab erosion damages caused by increased runoff from the Siuslaw fire. Eroded material has plugged two small culverts in the 27.1 road above the old stockpile site 09-54 and drainage has rerouted down the roadway causing gully damage to the roadbed and erosion of fillslope during last winter's rains (a potential road failure concern). This rehab would remove these two failed culverts, establish additional drainage where needed, and decommission the road by excavator tilling portions of the old roadbed. Utilizing woody debris and small trees adjacent to the road, portions of the old roadbed would be covered with debris to discourage OHV use of this old road.

Applicant (if any): None

B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans

LUP Name*: Eugene District Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan

Date Approved: June 1995; as amended January 2001.

Other document:** Siuslaw River Fire Emergency Fire Rehabilitation Plan and Environmental Assessment EA-03-04

Date Approved: FONSI and Decision Record; January 13, 2003

Other document:** BLM Manual Handbook H-1742-1 Emergency Fire Rehabilitation Handbook

Date Approved: July 1999

Other document:** LSR Assessment RO267/RO268

Date Approved: June 6, 1997

- *List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans or applicable amendments).**
- **List applicable activity, project, management, water quality restoration, or program plans.**

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions: See narrative below.

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions) and, if applicable, implementation plan decisions:

Minimize the impacts of wildfire suppression actions. Immediately establish an emergency team to develop a rehabilitation plan needed to attain Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives whenever Riparian Reserves are significantly damaged by a wildfire.

C. Identify the applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

Siuslaw River Fire Emergency Fire Rehabilitation Plan and Environmental Assessment EA-03-04

E-mail note of 4/11/03 first identifying the erosion problem from Siuslaw Botanist and Upper Willamette Soil Scientist and follow-up damage evaluation by Siuslaw Engineering and Fisheries dated 4/17/03 with suggested treatment for rehabilitation.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed?

Yes, very similar road and trail decommissioning and rehabilitation treatments were evaluated in the environmental assessment (EA-03-04). The issues analyzed in the Siuslaw fire rehab included road stability and minimizing erosion and sedimentation to streams.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances?

Yes, and the EA indicated the need for monitoring over time and the possible need for additional stabilization and rehabilitation measures in the next few years to ensure continued attainment of aquatic and upland resource objectives(page 18).

3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (including, for example, riparian proper functioning condition [PFC] reports; rangeland health standards assessments; Unified Watershed Assessment categorizations; inventory and monitoring data; most recent Fish and Wildlife

Service lists of threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species; most recent BLM lists of sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the proposed action?

Yes, this proposed road rehab is very similar to other old roads and trails within the fire perimeter which were decommissioned and seeded. Rehabilitation would occur this fall, prior to the onset of winter rains and would occur outside of any critical periods for T & E species.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?

Yes, as discussed above, this proposed road treatment is not unusual, and is in fact very similar to treatments accomplished under EA-03-04 initial implementation of the selected action alternative and during emergency suppression rehab.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

Yes, the EA indicates that that road rehab and seeding would reduce soil compaction and sedimentation. At the watershed scale and local scale (within the fire perimeter) the impacts from this rehab proposal are essentially the same and would be beneficial in the long term in terms of restoring hydrologic function, reducing compaction, and reducing sedimentation to streams.

6. Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

Yes, this small additional increment of road rehabilitation work would add little if any measurable effect to cumulative impacts analysis at the local(within the fire perimeter) or 5th field watershed level. However, an increment of benefit is expected as this proposed action would reduce or stop the sedimentation presently occurring. Without treatment it is expected to worsen this winter. The environmental analysis, EA-03-04, anticipated the potential need for additional treatments thru monitoring over time.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequately for the current proposed action?

Yes, the environmental assessment was available and advertised for public review and the decision record document was also subject to a protest period. No comments or protests were received during these periods.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the preparation of this worksheet.

Name	Title	Resource Represented
Gary Hoppe		Planner
Eric Meyers		Engineering
Leo Poole		Fisheries
Douglas Goldenberg		Botanist
Rudy Wiedenbeck		Soil Scientist

F. Mitigation Measures: List any applicable mitigation measures that were identified, analyzed, and approved in relevant LUPs and existing NEPA document(s). List the specific mitigation measures or identify an attachment that includes those specific mitigation measures. Document that these applicable mitigation measures must be incorporated and implemented.

Best Management Practices would be utilized as is standard practice with road rehabilitation and decommissioning. BLM would direct the work under a task order arrangement using FY03 2822 JL N897 funding.

Conclusion

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM=s compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

/s/ Steve Calish

Steve Calish, Field Manager, Siuslaw Resource Area

9/5/03

Date

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT/DECISION RECORD

I have reviewed this Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA) (OR090-DNA-03-02) and have determined that the proposed action is in conformance with the approved land use plan and that no further environmental analysis is required.

On the basis of the information contained in the DNA Worksheet and the existing NEPA documents it references, and all other information available to me, it is my determination that implementation of the proposed action will not have significant environmental impacts beyond those already addressed in the "Record of Decision for Amendments to Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Planning Documents within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl," (April 1994) and the "Eugene District Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan," (June 1995), and that an environmental impact statement or a supplement to the existing environmental impact statement is not necessary and will not be prepared.

It is my decision to implement the project, as described, with the mitigation measures identified in the DNA Worksheet. This wildfire management decision is issued under 43 CFR Part 5003.1 and is effective immediately. The BLM has made the determination that vegetation, soil, or other resources on the public lands within the Siuslaw River Fire are at substantial risk from continuing erosion. Thus, notwithstanding the provisions of 43 CFR 4.21(a)(1), the filing of a notice of appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 does not automatically suspend the effect of the decision. The Interior Board of Land Appeals must decide an appeal of this decision within 60 days after all pleading have been filed, and within 180 days after the appeal was filed. 43 CFR 4.416.

Authorized Official: /s/ Steve Calish
Steve Calish, Field Manager, Siuslaw Resource Area

Date: 9/5/03