

**Beatty Creek/Island Creek Land Exchange
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

South River Field Office

EA# OR-105-01-06

Date Prepared: March 5, 2002

Updated: March 6, 2003

Finding of No Significant Impact

The South River Field Office, Roseburg District, Bureau of Land Management (BLM), has completed the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Beatty Creek/Island Creek Land Exchange. Two alternatives were analyzed consisting of a “No Action” alternative identified as Alternative 1, and a “Proposed Alternative” identified as Alternative 2. The Alternatives are described in Chapter 2 of the EA (pp. 5-7).

The following Critical Elements of the Human Environment are not relevant because they are absent from the land exchange parcels, or would not be affected by the proposed exchange: Air Quality; Wetlands; Wild and Scenic Rivers; Wilderness, Visual Resource Management; and Wastes, Hazardous or Solid.

The proposed Beatty Creek/Island Creek Land Exchange is consistent with Executive Order 12898 which addresses Environmental Justice in minority and low-income populations. There would be no impacts to low-income or minority populations that have been identified by the BLM internally or through the public involvement process. Correspondence with local Native American tribal governments did not identify any known unique or special resources in the exchange parcels which provide employment, subsistence or recreation opportunities.

Correspondence with local Native American tribal governments did not identify any religious concerns or values associated with the proposed land exchange, so there would be no effect on Native American Religious Concerns (40 CFR § 1508.27 (b)(8)).

The proposed Beatty Creek/Island Creek Land Exchange would involve acquisition of lands by the BLM that are located within riparian areas and adjacent to an existing Area of Critical Environmental Concern/Research Natural Area (ACEC/RNA). The acquisition of riparian areas and subsequent allocation as Riparian Reserves would maintain existing aquatic conditions in those areas. The addition of adjacent lands to the existing ACEC/RNA would improve opportunities for the management of the relevant and important resource values for which the ACEC/RNA was established. There would be no affect to any of the unique characteristics of the areas (40 CFR § 1508.27 (b)(3)).

Section 106 responsibilities under the National Historic Preservation Act have been completed by the BLM in accordance with the 1998 Oregon State Historic Preservation Office protocols. As no cultural resources are known to exist on the Federal parcels, and any such resources on the offered lands would come under Federal control, there would be no impacts to scientific, cultural, or historical resources (40 CFR § 1508.27 (b)(8)).

The only terrestrial special status species known to utilize, or reasonably expected to utilize lands subject to the proposed exchange are the Federally-endangered Columbian white-tailed deer and the Federally-threatened northern spotted owl.

Harvest of the selected parcels by Roseburg Resources Company could result in a net loss of up to 183 acres of thermal/hiding cover for the Columbian white-tailed deer. This habitat is not considered high-quality habitat, and use by deer is probably infrequent. Additionally, the watersheds in which the selected parcels are located contain large areas of highly suitable foraging habitat and other thermal cover. The BLM has made a determination that the exchange is “not likely to adversely affect” Columbian white-tailed deer.

The land exchange could result in a net loss of one acre of suitable northern spotted owl habitat currently under Federal management. The BLM has made a determination that this would have a negligible effect and is “not likely to adversely affect” the northern spotted owl.

The BLM is engaged in informal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife on the determination of effects on the Columbian white-tailed deer and northern spotted owl with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

A determination was made that the proposed action was not likely to adversely affect Oregon Coast coho salmon and designated critical habitat, Oregon Coast steelhead trout, and Essential Fish Habitat. The proposed exchange would bring additional coho salmon Critical Habitat and Essential Fish Habitat under Federal ownership and BLM-administration. The establishment of Riparian Reserves under the ROD/RMP would afford protection to intermittent streams, as well as to perennial, fish-bearing and anadromous streams. The consequences to aquatic habitat and listed fish species are considered to be negligible. In a letter to BLM dated April 8, 2002, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) concurred with the determination that the proposed action is “not likely to adversely affect” Oregon Coast coho salmon or their designated critical habitats, Oregon Coast steelhead trout, or Essential Fish Habitat.

As a consequence, there would be no significant adverse impacts to any special status species (40 CFR § 1508.27 (b)(9)), and any impacts would be within the range and scope of those analyzed in the Roseburg District *Proposed Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement* (PRMP/EIS).

The proposed land exchange is consistent with applicable Federal, State, and local laws (40 CFR § 1508.27(b)(10)). The impacts of the proposed action on the human environment do not exceed those anticipated and addressed in the Roseburg District PRMP/EIS.

Of the twelve points listed under 40 CFR § 1508.27(b), the following were considered and found not to apply to the proposed action: significant beneficial or adverse effects; significant effects on public health or safety; effects on the quality of the human environment that are likely to be highly controversial; anticipated cumulatively significant impacts; highly uncertain or unknown risks; and no precedents for future actions with significant effects.

Based on the analysis of potential impacts contained in the EA, I have determined that the proposed action will not have significant impact on the human environment within the meaning of Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and that an EIS is not required. I have determined that the proposed action is in conformance with the Roseburg District PRMP/EIS and *Record of Decision/ Resource Management Plan* (June, 1995).

Mark A. Buckbee
Acting District Manager
Roseburg District Office

Date