

importance of snags and down logs to wildlife and recommend mitigation and restoration projects to ensure their persistence.

The Coos Bay District Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan specifically states that within the Matrix snags will be retained at levels sufficient to support species of cavity-nesting birds at 40% population levels. The RMP also encourages the implementation of habitat improvement projects in Late Successional Reserves to improve conditions for species associated with late successional forests.

The various Watershed Analyses identify current deficiencies of snags and down logs and recommend creating these structures to restore these key habitat elements to the landscape.

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

Coos Bay District Environmental Assessment OR128-00-18 Wildlife Habitat Tree and Log Creation, 2000.

The Biological Assessment for Forest Removal and Modification Projects (FY 2003-2004) and Other Land Management Activities (FY2003-2008) and the rendered Informal Consultation and letter of written concurrence. December 10, 2002.

Biological Opinion for Section 7 Formal Programmatic Consultation and Magnuson-Stevens Act Essential Fish Habitat Consultation on Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service, and BIA/Coquille Indian Tribe Actions Affecting Southern Oregon/Northern California Coho, Oregon Coast Coho Salmon, and Oregon Coast Steelhead. August 8, 2001.

Implementation of 2001 Survey and Manage Annual Species Review. BLM Instruction Memorandum No. OR-2002-064. June 14, 2002.

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 proposal to create snags and down logs is the same action previously analyzed.

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 range of alternatives analyzed was appropriate with respect to the proposal. The current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values have not changed.

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 conditions [PFC] reports; rangeland health standards and 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 further substantiated by information now available on the DecAID Advisor website which synthesizes the latest data and research on snags and down wood. In addition, conclusions of the existing analysis are still valid in light of January 2004 storms which caused no significant tree damage within project boundaries. It is reasonable to conclude that other new information and circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of 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?

Yes, the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing documents continues to be appropriate for the proposal to create snags and down logs, and no valid new technologies or methodologies exist. The efficacy of the methodologies analyzed will likely increase with the adherence to considerations for creating snags (diameter, species, external defect, etc.) outlined in the DecAID Advisor.

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 potential direct and indirect impacts of the proposed creation of snags and down logs are substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA documents. The Biological Assessment for Forest Removal and Modification Projects (FY 2003-2004) and Other Land Management Activities (FY2003-2008) identified potential impacts associated with the creation of snags and down logs (e.g., blasting, climbing, and associated disturbance). The rendered Informal Consultation and written concurrence outlines Project Design Criteria to mitigate for these effects. Impacts are addressed in terms of general landscape characteristics within the watersheds.

The Biological Opinion for Section 7 Formal Programmatic Consultation and Magnuson-Stevens Act Essential Fish Habitat Consultation on Bureau of Land Management, Forest Service, and BIA/Coquille Indian Tribe Actions Affecting Southern Oregon/Northern California Coho, Oregon Coast Coho Salmon, and Oregon Coast Steelhead determined that tree topping, girdling and other activities to enhance wildlife habitat would constitute a Not Likely to Adversely Affect (NLAA) effects determination on anadromous fish. Activities should not result in ground disturbance leading to a mechanism for sediment delivery to stream channels or a decrease in stream shade, coarse woody material supply, or stream bank stability. Additional mitigation measures are listed below. Site specific impacts were sufficiently analyzed in the existing EA.

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, the cumulative impacts are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing EA.

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

Yes, public involvement and interagency review of the EA was adequate for the current proposed action.

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

Name	Title	Resource Represented
Holly Witt	Wildlife Biologist	Myrtlewood Resource Area
Pam Olson	Fishery Biologist	Myrtlewood Resource Area
Nancy Brian	Botanist	Myrtlewood Resource Area
Stephen Samuels	Cultural Specialist	Myrtlewood Resource Area
Tim Votaw	Hazardous Materials	Myrtlewood Resource Area
Robert Raper	Noxious Weeds Specialist	Myrtlewood Resource Area

Dale Stewart
Matt Azhocar
Rick Schultz

Soils Scientist
Hydrologist
Forestry/Silviculture

Myrtlewood Resource Area
Myrtlewood Resource Area
Myrtlewood Resource Area

F. Mitigation Measures: List any applicable mitigation measures that were identified, analyzed, and approved in relevant LUPs and existing NEPA documents(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.

Wildlife: Actions will adhere to the Project Design Criteria (seasonal and daily timing restrictions and tree selection criteria) in the Informal Consultation on FY2003-2004 forest removal and modification projects and FY 2003-2008 other land management activities (#1-15-03-I-006), if bald eagle, Northern spotted owl, or marbled murrelet nesting or habitat sites are within stipulated distances. Trees that contain potential nest platforms or unique habitat features (e.g. broken tops, decay) will not be treated. Where required, survey and manage guidelines as amended in the NWFP will be adhered to for the protection of known survey and manage species' sites.

Fisheries: Trees selected for snag creation will be outside of a two crown width distance (approximately 30 feet) from all streams and will not preclude future wood recruitment to the stream. Near streams, tops will be directionally felled away from channels to avoid impacts to fish. Power equipment is to be refueled at least 150 feet distant from water bodies or as far as possible where conditions do not allow a 150-foot setback.

Botany: The standards and guidelines in the NWFP for Survey and Manage plants will be adhered to, as determined by a BLM staff botanist.

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.

Note: If one or more of the criteria are not met, a conclusion of conformance and/or NEPA adequacy cannot be made and this box cannot be checked.

Approved by: Myrtlewood Field Manager: /s/ Richard Conrad Date: