

**Worksheet**  
**Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance**  
**and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**  
**(OR090-DNA-04-01)**  
**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 Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Adequacy, transmitting this worksheet and the Guidelines 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 appeal able decision.

**A. BLM Office:** Siuslaw Resource Area                      **Case/Serial/Case File No.** N/A  
**Proposed Action Title/Type:** North Tributary of Leopold Creek – Aquatic Habitat Restoration  
**Location of Proposed Action:** T. 19 S., R. 8 W., Section 17, NW ¼.  
**Description of the Proposed Action:** During the summer of 2002, stream restoration and barrier culvert replacement efforts were completed in Mainstem and the North Fork of Leopold Creek. During the completion phase of these efforts it was noted that the North Tributary of Leopold Creek (~1500 stream feet above the new culvert replacement) had recently lost its' holding structure and had down cut to bedrock in over 90 percent of this reach. The proposed action is to replace lost instream structure with logs and boulders during the low water period (August – September).

**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\*\*:** Aquatic Conservation Strategy in the Northwest Forest Plan  
**Date Approved:** February 1994

**Other document\*\*:** Siuslaw Watershed Analysis  
**Date Approved:** February 1996

**Other document\*\*:** LSR Assessment RO267/RO268  
**Date Approved:** June 6, 1997

**Other document\*\*:** Upper Siuslaw River Aquatic Habitat Management Plan

**Date Approved:** March 1998

**Other document\*\*:** Esmo-Whitt Subwatershed Analysis

**Date Approved:** June 1998

**Other document\*\*:** Middle Siuslaw – Esmond Creek Aquatic Habitat Restoration Plan EA No. OR090-00-14

**Date Approved:** May 2000

**\*List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans or applicable amendments).**

**\*\*List applicable activity, project, management, water quality restoration, or program plans.**

**X 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:**

The Eugene District RMP EIS and ROD directs that BLM maintain or enhance the fisheries habitat potential of streams and other waters. As denoted in the North West Forest Plan Aquatic Conservation Strategy Objectives: Maintain and restore the physical integrity of the aquatic system and the complexity of watershed and landscape features.

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

Middle Siuslaw – Esmond Creek Aquatic Habitat Restoration Plan. Environmental Assessment No. OR090-00-14 dated April 2000.

Draft Restoration Plan for the North Tributary of Leopold Creek dated May 2003.

**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, the treatments as described in EA OR090-00-14 are the same as those implemented in the Mainstem and North Fork of Leopold Creek and the Mainstem of Esmond Creek in 2002. As denoted on page 5 of this EA, proposed actions will be completed in sequence over multiple years based on funding, planning and personnel. Emphasis for project work will be placed on Mainstem sites such as those previously mentioned, but will also include smaller non-named tributaries in the Esmond Creek Drainage.

**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. The environmental assessment evaluated a reasonable range of alternatives including the proposed action alternative, a no action alternative, and a partial implementation alternative. The EA also considered a variety of restoration techniques, materials, and equipment that would be used in project implementation.

**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?**

The existing analysis is adequate for the proposed action and no new circumstances, standards or guidelines have been identified since the signing of the ROD for EA- No. OR090-00-14. There have been no resource changes since the completion of the NEPA analysis. The proposed stream restoration work identified in the North Tributary of Leopold Creek is exactly like the proposed action.

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

Methods used during the 2002 implementation of EA- No. OR090-00-14 included effective, never used before techniques for the reduction of short term resource impacts. These techniques would be implemented during the proposed restoration of the North Tributary of Leopold stream reach. Other methods noted in the NEPA analysis will continue to be implemented as appropriate and related to stream restoration techniques.

**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?**

The direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action are the same as those denoted in EA OR090-00-14. The benefits from this action will assist in the attainment of ACS (Restoration) Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 9.

**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 1500 feet of instream restoration work would add little if any measurable effect to cumulative impacts analysis at the local (within the Esmond Creek Watershed) or 5<sup>th</sup> field watershed level. However, an increment of benefit is expected as this proposed action would immediately attain the ACS objectives mentioned in response number 5. Without action, the

potential exists for the continued degradation of stream habitat above the project reach as stable structure is lost due to high flow and the lack of stable down stream features in the proposed project area. As noted in EA- OR090-00-14, long term monitoring is necessary to evaluate the effects of the proposed action. It is this monitoring protocol that identified the existing degraded habitat and will identify future effects of the proposed action.

**7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate 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.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Resource Represented</b>
Leo Poole		Fisheries
Gary Hoppe		Planning/Environmental

**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 stream restoration. Mitigating measures identified on pages 16-17 of EA - No. OR090-00-14 would be followed. BLM would direct the work under a contract using onsite government project inspectors.

**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/ Steven Calish

**Steven Calish, Field Manager, Siuslaw Resource Area**

April 8, 2004

**Date**

## FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT/DECISION RECORD

I have reviewed this Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA) (OR090-DNA-04-01) 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), as amended, and that an environmental impact statement or a supplement to the existing environmental impact statement is not necessary and will not be prepared.

The BLM has made the determination that instream resources on the public lands within the Esmond/Leopold Creek drainage are at substantial risk from continuing degradation. Therefore, it is my decision to implement the project, as described, with the mitigation measures and best management practices referenced in the DNA Worksheet (mitigating measures on pages 16-17 of EA OR090-00-14).

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

**Date:** April 8, 2004