

Finding of No Significant Impacts (FONSI)

Millpond Maintenance Facility

Swiftwater Field Office, Roseburg District
EA# OR-104-07-01

The Swiftwater Field Office, Roseburg District, Bureau of Land Management has a need to replace the existing Rock Creek Maintenance Facility currently located on the east side of BLM Road 26-3-1.0, T. 25 S., R. 02 W., Section 21 due to safety and security concerns. The facility will be constructed at site #2 which is on the east side of BLM Road 26-3-1.0, T. 25 S., R. 02 W., Section 21, W.M..

The project area lies within the Riparian Reserve of Rock Creek and within the North Umpqua Special Recreation Management Area. It also lies within the existing boundary of the Millpond Recreation Site and approximately 0.25 mile south of the existing Rock Creek Maintenance Facility.

Test for Significant Impacts.

1. Has significant impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (1))?

Yes No

Remarks: Any impacts will be consistent with the range and scope of those effects analyzed and described in the Roseburg District Proposed Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/EIS).

2. Has significant adverse impacts on public health or safety (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (2))?

Yes No

Remarks: There are safety issues with the existing Rock Creek Maintenance Facility regarding proper emergency exit routes out of the building and rock fall from the surrounding hillside within the fenced perimeter of the facility (EA, pg. 3). The periodic storage of heavy equipment in the unfenced, overflow parking lot at the Millpond Recreation Site is easily accessible and may attract visitors (especially children) posing a potential safety hazard (EA, pg. 16-17).

The potential safety hazards posed by: (1) the periodic storage of heavy equipment in the unfenced, overflow parking lot at the Millpond Recreation Site, (2) inadequate emergency exits out of the existing Rock Creek building, and (3) the rock fall hazard at the existing Rock Creek Maintenance Facility will be removed under Action Alternative 2 (EA, pg. 19).

3. Adversely effects such unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources, park, recreation or refuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers, sole or principal drinking water aquifers, prime farmlands, wetlands, floodplains or ecologically significant or critical areas including those listed on the Department's National Register of Natural Landmarks (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (3))?

Yes No

Remarks: Site #2 is within the 100 year floodplain of Rock Creek (EA, pg 27). To minimize the risk of flooding from Rock Creek, approximately two feet of fill material will be required to build-up the site above the 100 year floodplain (EA, pg. 29). No unique characters of the flood plain have been identified in the proposed location of Site #2.

The remaining unique geographic characteristics listed above are absent from the project area and will not be affected.

4. Has highly controversial effects on the quality of the human environment (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (4))?

Yes No

Remarks: Comments were solicited from affected tribal governments, adjacent landowners and affected State and local government agencies. No comments were received from these sources. A letter was sent (January 29, 2007) to adjacent landowners. Three comments were received. One respondent inquired about the design of the proposed facility and two others requested to be added to the mailing list for this project (EA, pgs. 45-46).

A 30-day **public comment period** was established for review of the EA (July 3, 2007 through August 2, 2007). Comments were received during this from one organization. Upon reviewing the comments received, those that warranted additional clarification were addressed on pages 5-6 of the Millpond Maintenance Facility Decision Document. However, no comments were received that are considered highly controversial.

5. Has highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks to the human environment (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (5))?

Yes No

Remarks: The risks to the human environment from the proposed project were analyzed and found not to be highly uncertain or unique (EA, pgs. 51-53).

6. Establishes a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (6))?

Yes No

Remarks: The construction of a new maintenance facility (with associated building, grounds, and fencing) within the designated boundary

of an existing facility is a common practice and does not establish a precedent for future actions.

7. Is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (7))?

Yes No

Remarks: The cumulative impacts to recreation and visual resource management (pg. 19), wildlife (pgs. 26), hydrology (pgs. 30), soils (pg. 32), fish populations and habitat (pg. 34-35) were analyzed in the Millpond Maintenance Facility Environmental Assessment and found not to be significant.

8. Has adverse effects on districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (8))?

Yes No

Remarks: The BLM conducted surveys for cultural resources and completed Section 106 responsibilities under the National Historic Preservation Act, in accordance with the 1998 Oregon State Historic Preservation Office protocols. Historic archaeological site 35DO897, the Rock Creek Mill, was recorded in 2001. It is not considered eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The 2007 inventory did not reveal any additional resources (EA, pg. 14). Implementation of Action Alternative 2 will have no effect on historic properties or cultural resources (EA, pg. 14).

9. May adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (9))?

Botanical Species Yes No

Fish Species Yes No

Wildlife Species Yes No

Remarks: Surveys did not identify the presence of any federally threatened or endangered botanical species; therefore the action would have no effect on listed botanical species (EA, pgs. 43-44).

On February 4, 2008 NOAA Fisheries announced that it is listing the Oregon coast coho salmon evolutionary significant unit (ESU) as threatened under the Endangered Species Act. The Swiftwater fisheries staff has determined that this project will not directly or indirectly affect coho or their habitat. Without a mechanism for an effect, the selected Action Alternative 2 will be a “no effect” to the Oregon Coast coho salmon (Decision Document, pg. 3). There is Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) for the Oregon Coast coho and chinook salmon

50 feet downslope of Site #2 (EA, pgs. 35-36, 45). However, the Swiftwater Field Office determined that Action Alternative 2 will not adversely affect EFH for coho or Chinook salmon in Rock Creek or its tributaries (EA, pgs. 35-36, 45).

On March 13, 2007 Swiftwater Field Office biologists visited Sites #1 and #2 and conducted informal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. It was determined that Site #2, did not contain either suitable or dispersal habitat for the northern spotted owl. Therefore, selection of Action Alternative 2 was determined to have “no effect” on the northern spotted owl (Decision Document, pgs. 2-3).

10. Threatens to violate Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (10))?

Yes No

Remarks: The measures described above ensure that the Millpond Maintenance Facility will be consistent with all applicable Federal, State, and local laws. The impacts of construction and use of the maintenance facility on the human environment will not exceed those anticipated by the Roseburg District PRMP/EIS.

Pursuant to Executive Order 13212, the BLM must consider the effects of this decision on the President’s National Energy Policy. Within the project area, there are no known energy resources with commercial potential. There are no pipelines, electrical transmission lines, or energy producing or processing facilities. As a consequence, there will be no known adverse effect on National Energy Policy.

Based on the analysis of potential impacts contained in the environmental assessment, I have determined that the construction of the Millpond Maintenance Facility at Site #2 will not have a significant impact on the human environment within the meaning of Section 102(2) (c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and an environmental impact statement is not required. The effects of the construction of the Millpond Maintenance Facility at Site #2 is within those anticipated and already analyzed in the *Roseburg District Proposed Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement* (PRMP/EIS, 1994) and will be in conformance with the *Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan* (ROD/RMP) for the Roseburg District, approved by the Oregon/Washington State Director on June 2, 1995.

Marci L. Todd, Field Manager
Swiftwater Field Office

Date