

Dorena Office Construction Environmental Assessment

10/20/00

I. PURPOSE AND NEED/PROPOSED ACTION

A. Introduction

The Dorena Tree Improvement Center is a regional forest genetics facility serving the Pacific Northwest Region of the Forest Service. The Center also serves a variety of other federal, state, and county agencies in the area of disease resistance breeding.

This environmental assessment (EA) has been prepared to document the potential effects of implementing a proposal to construct a new office for the Dorena Tree Improvement Center. The purpose of this document is to analyze the proposed action and alternatives to the proposed action, and to disclose environmental effects in sufficient detail to aid in the selection of a course of action that will meet management objectives. The proposed action and alternatives are alternate locations for the new office within the Dorena administrative site and do not address the actual design of the new structure.

B. Land Management Direction

The Center is located on public land managed by the Bureau of Land Management and falls under the management direction of the 1995 Eugene District Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan (RMP/ROD). The site is administratively withdrawn under the RMP/ROD. As such, Standards and Guidelines found in the Eugene ROD, which apply to specific land use allocations, do not apply to the Dorena site. Best management practices and other management direction are to be applied through site management plans as approved by the designated official.

C. Purpose and Need

The Dorena Tree Improvement Center currently operates out of two temporary non-ADA office trailers. Due to the structural make-up and elevation of the existing trailers, it is impossible to bring them up to ADA standards. Further, these trailers are at or near the end of their useful life expectancy and do not currently provide an adequate quantity or quality of workspace needed for the conduct of the units program of work.

D. Proposed Action

The Dorena Tree Improvement Center proposes to replace the two existing temporary office trailers with a new approximately 4000 sf fully accessible ADA office. This proposal includes full utility connections, including electricity, phone, water, and septic. The proposal also

includes the development of a water reservoir to meet fire protection requirements. The proposed action would locate the new office west of the existing office trailers on the south side of the present entrance drive (see the site map with the proposed office location). This proposal would entail approximately 1.63 acres of ground disturbance for the construction of the office and development for parking, and 0.55 acres for the realignment of the entrance.

The Proposed Action and alternatives are in conformance with the 1995 Eugene District Resource Management Plan (RMP). The RMP allows for continued use and development of the Dorena Tree Improvement Center for its intended purposes.

E. Decisions to be Made

The District Manager for the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Eugene District, as the responsible official, will decide whether or not to approve construction of the new office facility with connected utilities, associated parking, entrance realignment, and water reservoir at the Dorena Tree Improvement Center administrative site. If a replacement facility were not approved, Dorena would continue in the current non-ADA accessible temporary trailers. If a replacement office and location are approved, the decision will specify any other conditions required to meet the RMP/ROD and the Cooperative Agreement between the Bureau of Land Management, Eugene District, and the Umpqua National Forest.

F. Location

The Dorena Tree Improvement Center is located on land managed by the Bureau of Land Management in Township 20S, Range 2W, Sec. 31 and 32, and Township 21S, Range 2W, Sec. 5 and 6. Under a 1984 cooperative agreement with the Eugene District of the Bureau of Land Management the Center manages areas designated for seed orchards, a research nursery, and an administrative site. The proposed new office would be built within the area designated for an administrative site in Section 32, Township 20S, Range 2W.

G. Scoping

1. Public involvement in the planning process for the new Dorena office was solicited through mailings. The Umpqua National Forest quarterly posts a Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA) for public input on projects being planned. The office construction project was first posted in April 2000. This document was mailed to approximately 700 interested publics and posted on the Umpqua National Forest homepage. A scoping letter was also mailed out to a list of interested publics maintained by the South Valley Resource Area of the Eugene District of the BLM, the City of Cottage Grove, and the Cottage Grove Lake office of the Army Corps of Engineers.
2. No written comments were received concerning the Dorena office construction.

3. A series of interdisciplinary team meetings were held to develop issues and alternatives.

H. Issues

Scoping and information sharing among Interdisciplinary Team members identified a number of issues. Some were outside the scope of the purpose and need of the proposed action, some were treated with facility design features, and some were key to the proposed action.

- 1) **Key issues** - - These issues were used to develop the proposed action alternatives.

- a) **The Forest Service wishes to provide a visually attractive administrative site that is inviting to the public.**

Does the proposed action site the new office where it can be seen from the public road? Is it attractive and inviting? Is the office accessible to persons of all ages and abilities?

- b) **The Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management wish to manage archeological (cultural) resources that are known or might be discovered.**

Will the new office construction affect historic or archaeological properties? Archeologists will conduct an inventory for archaeological resources within the area proposed for construction.

- c) **The Forest Service wishes to assure that there is an adequate supply of domestic water for potable and fire suppression needs.**

Will city water use in the nursery result in an inadequate supply of potable water for facility health and safety? Can adequate storage capacity be developed to address fire concerns? Are there alternative sources of water for nursery and fire suppression?

- d) **The Forest Service wishes to manage its administrative site in the most efficient manner possible.**

Does the proposed action site the office in a location that is conducive to efficient and effective workflows? Does it facilitate pedestrian circulation and vehicle traffic in a manner supportive of the Dorena program?

- 2) **Other issues** - - The following issues were not utilized to describe alternatives but are evaluated in the assessment and would be resolved with specific mitigation measures or facility design features.

- e) **Threatened, Endangered, or Sensitive wildlife and plant species.** The proposed action may affect threatened, endangered or sensitive wildlife or plant species or habitat. This would be determined by effects on habitat and species, and will be described in the Biological Evaluations prepared by the wildlife biologist and botanist.

- f) **Site hydrology.** The proposed action may affect stream hydrology and aquatic ecosystems.
- g) **Noxious weeds.** Construction of a new office may affect the introduction and spread of noxious weeds and other undesirable non-native plant species. This would be measured by the amount of site clearing and other ground disturbance.
- h) **Facility Support and Economics.** Construction of a new office building will affect existing utility connections and capacities. Water supply, especially for fire suppression, power for heating, cooling, and lighting the structure, and septic system additions must fit site limitations. This will be determined and incorporated into design features by Facility Engineers. Construction of a new office will improve the productivity of employees. The estimated loss of productivity is now \$75,000 per year. The direct cost of a new 4,000 SF office is estimated at \$450,115 (approximately \$112.53/ SF). The cost of companion projects necessitated by the office construction such as parking, entrance relocation, culvert replacement, landscaping, etc., is estimated at \$124,886. The FA&O program is scheduled to allocate \$110,000 in FY 2001 and \$620,000 in FY 2002. A separate request for \$56,500 road construction funds is also planned. These road construction funds are planned to be allocated in conjunction with the office contract package (i.e. one contract package with the office, utilities, roadwork and landscaping combined).

II. ALTERNATIVES

A. Formulation of Alternatives

The Dorena Tree Improvement Center proposes to replace the two existing temporary office trailers with a new approximately 4000 sf fully accessible ADA office. This proposal includes full utility connections, including electricity, phone, water, and septic. The proposal also includes the development of a water reservoir to meet fire protection requirements.

The principal factors driving the development of the alternatives for the office location were visibility to the general public and clients of the Dorena Tree Improvement Center, efficient utilization of existing infrastructure, and location relative to work flows to facilitate efficient use of the administrative site.

B. Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would be implemented with the selection of an action alternative:

public safety: Move the existing entrance approximately 145 feet to the south and realign the drive so that it is a ninety-degree intersection.

hydrology: Upgrade the culvert size on the west ditch to accommodate 100-year peak flow events. Minimize the removal of native vegetation, such as willows, in the stream channel above and below the culvert.

reservoir construction: When constructing water reservoir to meet fire protection requirements, construct the pond so that it can provide aquatic habitat. Some of the measures to meet this standard would include: an irregular shaped perimeter, sloping banks that are not steep, providing large woody debris for basking and cover habitat.

sediment control: Use best management practice measures to reduce sedimentation into the ditched streams during construction of the facilities, upgrading the culvert and construction of the water reservoir. Use of silt fences or hay bales within the ditches are examples of what can be used to implement this mitigation measure.

noxious weeds: Remove invasive vegetation and noxious weeds from the west ditch. Take measures during site preparation and construction to prevent the introduction of noxious weeds and other non-native plant species.

Keep soil disturbance to a minimum so as not to further spread noxious weeds.

After construction, immediately seed disturbed soil with lawn grasses or native shrubs and perennials to retard invasion by weedy species.

The population of Scotch broom along the west drainage should be eradicated to prevent further seed distribution downstream. The recommended removal method is manual cutting. Pulling, digging, or any other root upheaval would result in exposure of bare soils. The disturbed soil may encourage sprouting of Scotch broom seed and the soil is also available for colonization by other weedy species. Resprouting of cut stems may be prevented or minimized by cutting during mid-summer which is the period the plants are under the most stress. These areas will need repeated cutting in subsequent seasons to destroy sprouting plants and new seedlings. Mid-summer is also the season of seed maturity; extreme care must be exercised to prevent the scattering of seed to uninfected areas.

vegetative restoration: Where possible, a variety of native plants will be used for landscaping and the vegetative restoration of the east and west ditches.

heritage resources: Known cultural sites will be protected. A cultural resource inventory of areas with a high probability for archaeological resources has been completed. No archaeological or historic resources were located during this inventory. If cultural material is found during project construction, ground-disturbing activities shall be halted until an evaluation can be completed by the Umpqua NF and/or Eugene District BLM archeologists.

protection of infrastructure: Small cotton wood trees, 2-6 inches in diameter, in the vicinity of power lines will be removed. The trees to be removed are just north of the driveway culvert and near the transformer south of the drive.

C. Description of Alternatives

Alternative A (No Action/No Change Alternative)

The no action alternative leaves conditions as they currently exist.

This alternative would not respond to the needs for which the Dorena Office Construction Proposal was developed. It is offered as a baseline against which to evaluate alternatives.

Alternative B (Proposed Action)

As described in Section I of this assessment, the proposed action would locate the new office west of the existing office trailers on the south side of the present entrance drive (see the site map with the alternative office locations). This proposal would entail approximately 1.63 acres of ground disturbance for the construction of the office and development of a new paved parking lot. An additional .55 acres would be disturbed for the realignment of the paved entrance. A footbridge will also be installed over the west ditch to allow access between the office and the greenhouses.

Alternative C (Existing Office Site)

This alternative would locate the new office on the existing office site (see the site map with the alternative office locations). This proposal would entail approximately 1.0 acre of ground disturbance for the construction of the office and refurbishing of the existing parking lot. An additional .55 acres would be disturbed for the realignment of the entrance. This alternative would require the temporary displacement of Center employees during construction.

Alternative D (Existing Parking Lot Site)

This alternative would locate the new office east of the existing office trailers on the present parking lot (see the site map with the alternative office locations). This proposal would entail approximately .69 acres of ground disturbance for the construction of the office, refurbishing the existing parking lot, and the development of additional parking. An additional .55 acres would be disturbed for the realignment of the entrance.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

A. **Effects of the Alternatives on Key Issues** – These issues were used to develop the proposed action alternatives.

- a) **The Forest Service wishes to provide a visually attractive administrative site that is inviting to the public.** Does the proposed action site the new office where it can be seen

from the public road? Is it attractive and inviting? Is the office accessible to persons of all ages and abilities?

Alternative A (No Action)

This alternative would not provide the benefits and enhancements described for other alternatives, as no project would occur.

Alternative B (Proposed Action)

Sense of Arrival This alternative would provide the best sense of arrival as the visitor would upon reaching the crest of the hill on the highway have their vision drawn to the left due to the existing open space. Trees at the back of this opening would act as a backdrop for the new office building, thus aiding the visitor in locating their destination.

Aesthetic Setting This alternative would provide the best aesthetic setting for the office building as existing trees and vegetation along the creek and in the center of the field will create a spatial location. This vegetation (including mature trees) creates the spatial walls within which the building is placed. No other nursery functions are located in this space.

Experiential This alternative would provide the best experiential relationship between the office experience and the nursery experience for workers and visitors. It would provide a transition (the footbridge across the creek) when going from the office to the nursery areas. It would also separate the two different functioning areas from each other and provide good pedestrian/vehicle circulation separation.

Alternatives C (Existing Office Site) and D (Existing Parking Lot Site)

Sense of Arrival These alternatives would provide a poor sense of arrival as they are located behind a screen of trees and vegetation that do not allow the visitor to make visual connection to their destination; the entrance sign is their only visual clue.

Aesthetic Setting These alternatives would provide a poor aesthetic setting, as they are located in the same space as the nursery buildings (industrial visual elements). There are some existing mature trees, but they provide no spatial enclosure.

Experiential These alternatives would provide no positive experiential relationship between the office experience and the nursery experience for workers and visitors. There is no transition when going from the office to the nursery areas, because they are located in the same place.

- b) **The Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management wish to manage archeological (cultural) resources that are known or might be discovered.**

Archeologists have conducted an inventory to determine if historic or archaeological properties are located in the area proposed for construction activities. No historic or archeological properties potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places were discovered during the inventory.

Alternative A (No Action/No Change Alternative)

The no action alternative leaves conditions as they currently exist.

Alternative B (Proposed Action) An appropriate inventory has been conducted for this alternative and archaeological properties potentially eligible for the National Register of Historic Places were not located. This alternative has the potential to disturb 1.63 acres of ground disturbance for the construction of the office and the development of a new parking lot. An additional .55 acres will be disturbed for the realignment of the entrance. There is little potential for undiscovered archaeological resources in either locality. However, the construction project will be monitored during ground disturbing activities. In the eventuality that undiscovered cultural resources are located, all construction activities with the potential to affect these resources will be stopped until archaeologists have evaluated the properties.

Alternative C (Existing Office Site) This proposal would entail the disturbance of 1 acre for construction of the new office and .55 acres for the realignment project. There is little potential for undiscovered archaeological resources to be found at these localities. However, the construction project will be monitored during ground disturbing activities. In the eventuality that undiscovered cultural resources are located, all construction activities with the potential to affect these resources will be stopped until archaeologists have evaluated the properties.

Alternative D (Existing Parking Lot Site) This proposal would disturb .69 acres for the construction of the office, refurbishing and development of additional parking plus .55 acres for the realignment project. There is little potential for undiscovered archaeological resources to be located during the course of the project. However, the construction project will be monitored during ground disturbing activities. In the eventuality that undiscovered cultural resources are located, all construction activities with the potential to affect these resources will be stopped until archaeologists have evaluated the properties.

- c) **The Forest Service wishes to assure that there is an adequate supply of domestic water for potable and fire suppression needs.** Will city water use in the nursery result in an inadequate supply of potable water for facility health and safety? Can adequate storage capacity be developed to address fire concerns? Are there alternative sources of water for nursery and fire suppression?

Alternative A (No Action/No Change Alternative)

This alternative would be no change.

Alternative B (Proposed Action)

This alternative would not change the supply of domestic water. Fire suppression needs would be provided for the new office only. These needs would be established in the Prospectus stage of the project process. A fire protection sprinkler system would be designed for the office. A 25,000-gallon pond would be developed as a water source for this system. The pond water would come from the Row River. No alternative sources of water are available.

Alternative C (Existing Office Site)

See above.

Alternative D (Existing Parking Lot Site)

See above.

- d) **The Forest Service wishes to manage its administrative site in the most efficient manner possible.** Does the proposed action site the office in a location that is conducive to efficient and effective workflows? Does it facilitate pedestrian circulation and vehicle traffic in a manner supportive of the Dorena program?

Alternative A (No Action/No Change Alternative)

This alternative would not provide the benefits described for the other alternatives.

Alternative B (Proposed Action)

This alternative would increase the productivity of employees by providing new and ADA accessible working space. This office location would be further removed from the greenhouse areas. This is considered to be a minor detraction for this alternative. Pedestrian traffic, especially visitors, will have a more direct access to the facility. Vehicle traffic is improved by separating the vehicles of visitors and employees from the greenhouse areas leaving them free for work vehicles and large delivery trucks.

Alternative C (Existing Office Site)

This alternative would be no change. The existing congestion of traffic here would remain.

Alternative D (Existing Parking Lot Site)

This alternative would add to the congestion of the greenhouse areas by moving employee and visitor parking closer in to the greenhouses.

B. **Effects of Alternatives on Other Issues** - The following issues were not utilized to describe alternatives but are evaluated in the assessment and would be resolved with specific mitigation measures or facility design features.

- e) **Threatened, Endangered, or Sensitive wildlife and plant species**. The proposed action may affect threatened, endangered or sensitive wildlife or plant species or habitat.

No threatened or endangered species are known to occur on lands administered by the Dorena Tree Improvement Center. No threatened, endangered, or sensitive species were found during surveys. The proposed activities are therefore not expected to contribute to a trend toward federal listing or loss of viability to any sensitive species.

The proposed activity was determined to have no effects on any threatened or endangered species.

- f) **Site hydrology**. The proposed action will affect stream hydrology and aquatic ecosystems.

Alternative A (No Action/No Change Alternative):

There will be no short-term sediment effects from constructing an office facility or from constructing a pond. However, long-term aquatic pond habitat will not be created.

The no action alternative will maintain existing conditions. The west tributary culvert where the entrance road crosses will remain undersized. This culvert will continue to cause the channel to backup and flood during high water events. Flooding during an extreme flow event can cause the stream banks and the road to erode, resulting in fine sediment being deposited downstream. In addition, the undersized culvert constricts the channel, which causes a higher velocity to be released at the downstream end. This has caused the channel to down cut and erode. This fine sediment will predominantly be deposited downstream in a low gradient ditched channel within Schwartz Park. However if the culvert was to get blocked during a storm event it has a higher likelihood of failing in the current condition. The fine sediment may eventually reach the Row River creating direct, indirect and cumulative effects.

Fine sediment can affect the stream habitat by filling in the gravel and cobble substrate. These interstitial spaces between the cobbles and gravels are important well-oxygenated spaces where insects that fish feed on live and where trout and other salmonids lay their eggs. If fine sediment is deposited in these areas the oxygenated water can no longer flow through the area and it results in a loss of spawning insect habitat.

The open riparian areas devoid of tree and shrub vegetation along the east tributary would remain in the existing condition. There is high likelihood that the cottonwood trees growing in the riparian that are proposed for removal would be removed through another project. These trees are interfering with the tree improvement center production, are a

potential safety hazard and are also interfering with power lines. Riparian areas for both tributaries will not be enhanced under this alternative. Non-native riparian vegetation, such as Himalayan blackberries and Scotch broom will continue to persist within the riparian. Since these streams are dry during the summer months, temperature will not be affected. However the poor habitat conditions for amphibians and other species that would use these streams during the wetter months will remain in the current condition.

Alternative B, C and D (All Action Alternatives):

Construction of the new facility and the pond for all action alternatives will result in short term (limited to the construction phase) sediment impacts to the stream channels (see above for affects fine sediment has on stream habitat). However these direct and indirect affects are expected to be low. The stream channels have been altered through ditching and removal of riparian vegetation. These ditched streams are intermittent channels and do not provide fish habitat. Other aquatic species such as amphibians may be present. Downstream from the project area, the streams join together and flow through a ditch in Schwarz Park. The ditch is flat and along the road. Much of the sediment will be deposited here and may only be transported downstream into the Row River during times of high flows. Cumulative impacts to the Row River are likely to be low since much of the sediment is expected to be deposited into the ditch within Schwarz Park.

Ground disturbance for the action alternatives vary from 2.18 to 1.24 acres. A moderate to high amount of sediment is expected from alternative B with a moderate amount for alternatives C and D. The impacts will be short term and are not likely to have a large direct, indirect or cumulative impact to the Row River.

The constructed reservoir will provide aquatic pond habitat. This will result in direct long-term aquatic benefits.

The vegetation along the ditched streams will be enhanced through these action alternatives. Vegetation, especially large and overhanging vegetation, along the stream channel can help provide shade and habitat for aquatic and terrestrial species. Better habitat is provided when native vegetation is present. Non-native vegetation (Himalayan blackberries and Scotch broom) will be removed through the action alternatives. Part of the east ditched stream that currently has a riparian limited to grass will be planted with low growing natives such as dogwood.

Large cottonwood trees will be removed from the east stream through another project. The removal of these trees will negatively impact to the stream channel. The trees currently provide habitat and shade to the stream channels. However these trees affect the production of the Tree Improvement Center and create a safety concern for employees. Since the site is specifically withdrawn for seed orchard management, the removal of these cottonwoods is consistent with the management for this site. Riparian enhancement can occur with this project by planting lower growing native species where the cottonwoods are removed.

Cottonwood trees will be removed along the west ditched stream through this project. There is a group of trees just downstream from the culvert on the entrance road, and another cluster of trees approximately 30 feet upstream from the culvert that interfere with the power lines. The removal of these trees will have a negative impact on the stream channel. However, low growing species that will not eventually interfere with power lines will be planted in these areas.

Specific to Alternative B (Proposed Action):

A footbridge will be installed over the west ditched stream for easy access between the office facilities and the greenhouses. This bridge will remove a clump of willows adjacent to the cottonwoods that will be removed on the upper end of the stream. The removal of these willows and the installation of the footbridge will reduce riparian vegetation. This will have a direct long-term negative impact. However, the impacts are expected to be low given the ditched condition the stream is in and the limited habitat it is currently providing.

Table displaying aquatic effects from alternatives:

	Alternative A	Alternative B	Alternative C	Alternative D
Short term Sediment input from Construction	None (0 acres of Disturbance)	Moderate/High (2.18 acres of Disturbance)	Moderate (1.55 acre of Disturbance)	Moderate (1.24 acres of Disturbance)
Long term Sediment input from Road Crossing	Moderate (No Culvert upgraded)	Low (Culvert will be upgraded)	Low (Culvert will be upgraded)	Low (Culvert will be upgraded)
Aquatic Pond Enhancement	None	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
Riparian Enhancement	None	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate

- g) **Noxious weeds**. Construction of a new office may affect the introduction and spread of noxious weeds and other undesirable non-native plant species. This would be measured by the amount of site clearing and other ground disturbance.

Alternative A (No Action/No Change Alternative):

Direct effects and Indirect Effects: Noxious weeds along the riparian channel would continue to spread and dominate the riparian community. Existing populations of Scotch broom and Himalayan blackberry along the west drainage would continue to increase and would most likely out compete all other shrubs along the riparian area. Further, these populations would continue to disperse seed via the drainage, spreading the populations downstream.

Alternative B (Proposed Action):

Direct effects and Indirect Effects: Activities proposed as part of the construction of the new building would create potential habitat for noxious weeds and would likely result in an overall increase in weed density within the analysis area. This alternative would disturb about 1.63 acres of ground for the construction of the office and development for parking, and 0.55 acres for the realignment of the entrance. Pavement would prevent spread of noxious weeds and non-native species into some disturbed soils. The remaining exposed soil would be vulnerable to infestation by neighboring noxious weeds and other invasive non-native species. Additionally, newly landscaped areas would be especially vulnerable to re-invasion. Creation of a pond would eliminate an equivalent area of introduced non-native grasses and weeds; however, associated disturbed soils would be vulnerable to re-invasion.

Cumulative effects: Control and/or removal of Scotch broom along the west drainage would eliminate the possibility of future seed dispersal downstream and would control the spread of Scotch broom within the analysis area.

Alternative C (Existing Office Site):

Direct effects and Indirect Effects: Locating the new office on the existing office site would disturb approximately 1.0 acre for the construction of the office and development for parking, and 0.55 acres for the realignment of the entrance. Other direct and indirect effects are the same as described under Alternative B.

Cumulative effects: Same as Alternative B.

Alternative D (Existing Parking Lot Site):

Direct effects and Indirect Effects: Approximately .69 acres of ground disturbance would occur for the construction of the office and development of additional parking, and 0.55 acres for the realignment of the entrance. Other direct and indirect effects are the same as described under Alternative B.

Cumulative effects: Same as Alternative B.

- h) **Facility Support and Economics** Construction of a new office facility will affect existing utility connections and capacities. Water supply from Cottage Grove municipality, power from Lane Electric Cooperative, and septic system provided by the Army Corps must adequately service the new structure. This would be determined and incorporated into the design features by Facility Engineers.

Alternative A (No Action/No Change Alternative):

The alternative would represent no change and result in employee productivity loss due to present inadequate, decrepit and non-ADA accessible facilities, which would not change. The value of this loss of productivity is calculated to be \$75,000 per year.

Alternatives B (Proposed Action):

This alternative would fully address the need to replace two inadequate, non-ADA accessible temporary office trailers with a structure that will provide a sufficient quantity and quality of workspace.

Alternative C (Existing Office Site):

This alternative would fully address the need to replace two inadequate, non-ADA accessible temporary office trailers with a structure that will provide a sufficient quantity and quality of workspace. It would require no additional parking, thus saving \$41,314 plus miscellaneous other overhead costs associated with this feature. Also, the need for the footbridge across the west drainage would no longer exist resulting in a savings of \$8,370. There would be additional costs, however, associated with the displacement of the workforce for approximately 9 months. This alternative would also result in the loss of two dry, heated storage areas, which are now the current offices.

D (Existing Parking Lot Site):

This alternative would fully address the need to replace two inadequate, non-ADA accessible temporary office trailers with a structure that will provide a sufficient quantity and quality of workspace. Costs would be essentially the same as Alternative B. The only difference would be the elimination of the footbridge across the west drainage resulting in a savings of \$8,370.

C. Unaffected Resources

The following resources are either not present or would not be affected by any of the Alternatives: air quality, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, cultural resources, prime or unique farm lands, flood plains, Native American religious concerns, threatened or endangered species, water quality, solid or hazardous wastes, Wild and Scenic Rivers, Wilderness, minority populations and low income populations.

IV. CONSULTATION WITH OTHERS

Interdisciplinary Team Members:

John Petrick – Silviculturist, Dorena Tree Improvement Center, ID Team Leader
Debra Barner – Archeologist, Umpqua National Forest
Rob Cox – Wildlife Biologist, Cottage Grove Ranger District
Steve Wood – Facilities Engineer, Umpqua National Forest

Others consulted:

Ken Johnson - City of Cottage Grove Fire Chief
Michael Jones – Forest Hydrologist, Umpqua National Forests
Steve Hofford – Hydrologist, Umpqua National Forest
Laurie Bernstein – Fisheries Biologist, Cottage Grove Ranger District
Melissa Kirkland – Botanist, Cottage Grove Ranger District
Gary Loeffler – Landscape Architect, Mount Hood National Forest
Mike Southard – Archeologist, Eugene District, Bureau of Land Management
Rob Spence – Facilities Maintenance, Dorena Tree Improvement Center

NOTE: Map is available during business hours (7:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.) at the Dorena Tree Improvement Center, 34963 Shoreview Road, Cottage Grove, Oregon