Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
US Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

Umpqua Field Office Culvert Projects
DNA No. 6 to EA OR120-02-12

A. BLM Office: Coos Bay District, Umpqua Field Office Lease/Serial/Case File No. N/A

Proposed Action Title/Type: Umpqua Field Office Culvert Projects

Names and Locations of Proposed Actions:

- Middle Creek unnamed tributary II; Sec. 4, T 27 S., R 10 W.
  Road # 27-11-29.0, MP 11.5
- Little Paradise Creek unnamed tributary; Sec. 11, T.22 S., R 08 W.
  Road # 22-08-10.0, MP 0.5
- Upper West Fork Smith River unnamed tributary; Sec. 36, T. 19 S., R. 9 W.
  Road # 19-08-31.0, MP 0.7
- West Fork Smith River Oxbow; Sec. 1, T. 20 S., R. 9 W.
  Road # 20-09-27.01, MP 9.2
- Buck Creek (culvert modification); Sec. 4, T. 23 S., R. 9 W.
  Road # 23-09-04.00, MP 0.75
- Halfway Creek: Sec. 1, T. 21 S., R. 8 W.
  Road # 21-08-01.00A, MP 0.1
- Koepke Creek (tributary to Dean Creek EVA): Sec. 5, T. 22 S., R. 11 W.
  Koepke Slough East Service Road
- Mast Creek: Sec. 33, T. 22 S., R. 10 W.
  Road # 20-11-36.0, MP 4.8

Descriptions of the Proposed Actions:

Middle Creek unnamed tributary II: There is approximately 0.25 miles of low-gradient habitat upstream of the culvert that would be accessible to adult and juvenile salmonids, lamprey, and other aquatic-dependant species if the culvert is replaced. Although it is structurally sound, the existing culvert is impassable to all aquatic life forms other than adult coho salmon and steelhead trout. The proposed replacement is an arched culvert with interior baffles and weirs; an open-bottom structure is not practicable at this location because of the difference in streambed elevation above and below the culvert caused by the down-cutting of the channel downstream. An accumulation of woody debris immediately upstream of the existing culvert caused by culvert blockage will also need to be moved to immediately below the culvert in order to facilitate fish passage. The waste area for the culvert project is off the 27-10-5.1 road (Mungers Road) at an existing waste area as identified on the project maps. Equipment involved in the project will be staged along the Middle Creek Access Road in the vicinity of the project.

Little Paradise Creek unnamed tributary: There is approximately 0.2 miles of low-gradient habitat upstream of the existing culvert, which is perched approximately 2 feet at the outlet, and is a complete barrier to fish because of the jump height and slope of the culvert. Although the culvert is structurally sound, it is undersized for the size of the drainage area. Because of the elevation difference over the span of the road caused by the down-cutting of Little Paradise Creek, the replacement culvert would be an arch pipe with interior weirs to provide a series of resting pools. Boulder structures would also be placed in Little Paradise Creek to backwater the culvert entrance and improve passage conditions. The waste area for the culvert project is in the same section, as identified on the attached project maps. The staging area for equipment and materials involved in the project will also be in the vicinity of the project site and waste area.

Upper West Fork Smith River unnamed tributary: There is approximately 1.5 miles of habitat upstream of the culvert proposed for replacement that is currently accessible only to adult salmonids due to a perched outlet. The proposed replacement is an arch culvert that will provide passage for all life stages of resident and anadromous fish. The waste area for the project is located near the confluence of the WF Smith River and Church Creek in Sec. 31, T. 19 S., R. 8 W. as shown on the project map. The general vicinity of the waste area will also be used for equipment staging.

West Fork Smith River Oxbow: This project would involve the replacement of a small, undersized culvert with one that will provide juvenile fish passage to over 1 acre of off-channel pond that was formerly a meander of the West Fork Smith River. Because of the elevation change between the former channel and the mainstem of the WF Smith River, a concrete structure with a series of resting pools will need to be constructed to facilitate passage through the culvert. Up to three boulder weirs would also be placed in the mainstem of the West Fork Smith River in order to improve access to the concrete structure. The waste area for the project is located approximately 0.2 miles to the east of the project site as shown on the project map.

Buck Creek: The existing culvert, which contains off-set baffles, was replaced in 1999, but has yet to function as designed because very little stream substrate has been retained within the culvert. The proposed action is to place cobble-sized rock throughout the culvert bottom in order to provide the roughness necessary to retain gravel sized substrate. A waste area will not be necessary because of the nature of the project, and all ground-disturbing activities will be limited to the existing road prism and previously disturbed areas in the immediate vicinity of the culvert.

Halfway Creek: Near it's confluence with the Smith River, Halfway Creek was diverted into a constructed channel in the early 1960's, probably because of maintenance problems with the double culverts that the stream previously passed through. The proposal is to replace the double culverts on the road crossing the abandoned channel with a bridge, and restore flow to the channel (a separate NEPA document, EA OR125-04-10, analyzes the re-routing of the stream to the original channel). A culvert would not be a suitable replacement because the active channel width of lower Halfway Creek is approximately 30 feet. The replacement would improve passage conditions for adult and juvenile salmonids to approximately 2.2 miles of habitat. Suitable waste material from the road crossing would be placed in the constructed channel, and

the remainder would be transported to a stable area within ¼ mile of the stream crossing, as shown on the project map. The staging area for equipment is on lower Halfway Creek near the confluence with the Smith River.

Koepke Creek: This stream is a tributary to the "C" ditch system in the Dean Creek Elk Viewing Area (DCEVA), which drains into the Umpqua River through a tide-gated culvert under Highway 38 near the kiosk. Although it's believed to be an uncommon occurrence, in the late fall of 2002 coho salmon passed through the tide-gated culvert and spawned in Koepke Creek. Therefore, it's reasonable to expect that salmonids will migrate into the upper reaches of the stream and spawn again at some time in the future. The existing culvert on Koepke Creek is perched and blocks upstream passage of juvenile salmonids and other less mobile fish species such as three-spine stickleback and cottid (sculpin) species that have also been observed in the ditch system in DCEVA. The replacement culvert would be countersunk in the substrate to enable fish passage at any time flows are sufficient to support fish in the upper drainage. The waste area would be at an upland storage site located east of Koepke creek as shown on the project map.

Mast Creek: The current culvert on Mast Creek is undersized and needs to be replaced because of considerable rust and deterioration affecting the structural integrity of the road crossing. The proposed replacement would be an open-bottom culvert on concrete footings, simulating a natural stream channel and improving fish passage to approximately one-half mile of low gradient habitat.

Because the Mast Creek work site is located on the lower Smith River Mainline, a single-lane bypass would be constructed immediately adjacent to the work site prior to excavation associated with the culvert replacement. The bypass is expected to be utilized for up to two to three weeks, and traffic control will be established by stop signs located at each end, and flashing barricades with appropriate signage alerting traffic to the construction site. The waste area for the project will be on the adjacent private landowner's property.

Applicant (if any): N/A

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

Coos Bay District Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan. Date Approved: May, 1995.

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

The Aquatic Conservation Strategy[1] (ACS) was developed to restore and maintain the ecological health of the watershed and aquatic ecosystems contained within them on public lands. The strategy would protect salmon and steelhead habitat on federal lands managed by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management within the range of Pacific Ocean anadromy (*Coos Bay District RMP* ROD, 1994, Standards and Guidelines.p.B-9).

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

Fish passage projects are addressed in BLM EA OR120-02-12, Coos Bay District Culvert and Stream Crossing Environmental Assessment, approved June 28, 2002.

On December 10, 2002, the Coos Bay District BLM received a Letter of Concurrence (LOC) from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service authorizing certain "Not Likely to Adversely Affect" activities (Ref. 1-1 5-03-I-006) affecting the marbled murrelet (*Brachyamphus marmoratus*), marbled murrelet critical habitat, the northern spotted owl (*Strix occidentalis caurina*), spotted owl critical habitat, and the bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalis*). On January 7, 2003, the Coos Bay District also received a Biological Opinion (BO) from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service authorizing certain "Likely to Adversely Affect activities (Ref # 1-15-03-F-040) affecting these same species. Culvert projects will be covered under either of these documents depending on site specific conditions.

On October 18, 2002, the Coos Bay District BLM received a Programmatic BO (2002/00879) from NOAA fisheries authorizing certain "Likely to Adversely Affect" activities affecting Southern Oregon/ Northern California Coho Salmon, Oregon Coast Coho Salmon, and Oregon Coast Steelhead. Consultation for Essential Fish Habitat as required by the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act was also completed with the issuance of the BO. Culvert replacements projects such as those listed in this document are covered under the BO, and further consultation is not required.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria.

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

The proposed actions are not located at sites specifically identified in the EA. However, the design features and anticipated environmental consequences of the projects are essentially the same as those analyzed in the existing NEPA document. The EA analyzed the replacement of culverts at various locations across the District and a broad range of affected environments and environmental consequences were analyzed. The ground-disturbing activities, impacts to water

---

[1] The appropriate landscape scale for evaluating the consistency of individual and groups of projects with the ACS is the watershed, corresponding with the fifth field hydrologic unit code (HUC) as defined in the "Federal Guide for Ecosystem Analysis at the Watershed Scale."

quality, and project timing (restricted to low-flow periods during summer months) involved in these projects are essentially the same.

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 IPFCI reports; rangeland health standards assessments; Unified Watershed Assessment categorizations; inventory and monitoring data; most recent Fish and WildIife 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?

No new information or circumstances are known which would affect the validity of the existing analysis.

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

The methodology and analytical approach used in the EA are appropriate to the proposed actions. The culvert replacements analyzed involve similar stream channel characteristics and environmental conditions.

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?

Based on review by an interdisciplinary team (listed below in Section E), the anticipated direct and indirect effects of the proposed actions are essentially the same as identified in the EA. While the existing NEPA document does not analyze the site-specific impacts of the current proposed action, the existing environmental factors, design features, and anticipated environmental consequences are expected to be similar in nature.

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

Yes. The cumulative impacts of the proposed action are essentially unchanged.

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

The EA had a 30 day comment period, as will the decision record for this DNA, providing opportunity for the public or other agencies to comment on the proposed actions. The comment periods are adequate for the scope of the projects. Permits for the projects will be obtained through the Oregon Division of State Lands and U.S. Army Corp of Engineers after approval by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife.

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

Name	Title	Resource Represented
John Chatt	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife
Dan Van Slyke	Fisheries Biologist	Fisheries
John Colby	Hydrologist	Hydrology
Jennifer Sperling	Botanist	Botany
Scott Knowles	Natural Resource Specialist	Environmental Justice, Noxious Weeds and Port Orford Cedar
Tim Votaw	HazMat Coordinator	Hazardous Materials
Tim Barnes	District Geologist	Geology, Soils and Energy Development
Stephan Samuels	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources
Tom Wilczek	District Engineer	Engineering

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 constitute BLM's compliance to the requirements of NEPA.

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

Approved By:

Umpqua Field Office Manager: ____*s/s Ralph Thomas*__ Date:_____*5/11/2004*_____
M. Elaine Raper