

**U.S. Department of Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Roseburg BLM District, Oregon**

**East Fork Rock Creek In-stream Restoration
Decision Document**

SECTION 1 – THE DECISION

Decision

It is my decision to authorize the Proposed Action (Alternative Two) as described in the East Fork Rock Creek In-stream Restoration Environmental Assessment (EA) in Chapter 2 (EA #OR-104-08-04; pgs. 4-10). The East Fork Rock Creek In-stream Restoration project will place a total of 25 logs into four sites along a 600-foot section of East Fork Rock Creek in Section 19 of T. 25 S., R. 01 W., Willamette Meridian.

The logs will be placed using a cable yarding system and the cable yarder will remain on existing gravel surfaced roads adjacent to the project area. Logs will be placed during the in-stream work period of July 1st through September 15th, unless timing extensions were approved by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and BLM. No new roads will be built; no existing roads will be closed or obliterated. The project will be coordinated, financed, and implemented by PacifiCorp.

This project is within the Riparian Reserve Land Use Allocations and is in conformance with management direction from the ROD/RMP. This decision is subject to administrative remedy under 43 CFR § 5003.2 and 5003.3.

Compliance and Monitoring

Compliance with this decision will be ensured by frequent on the ground inspections by the Contracting Officer's Representative. Monitoring will be conducted as per the direction given in Appendix I of the RMP (pgs. 189-209).

SECTION 2 – THE DECISION RATIONALE

The Project Design Features described in the EA (pgs. 9-10) will minimize soil compaction, limit erosion, protect slope stability, protect wildlife habitat, protect fish habitat, protect air and water quality, as well as protect other identified resource values. I have reviewed the resource information contained in the EA. This decision recognizes that impacts could occur to some of these resources; however, the impacts to resource values will not exceed those identified in the *Final - Roseburg District Proposed Resource Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/EIS)*.

Chapter 2 of the EA describes two alternatives: a "No Action" alternative and a "Proposed Action" alternative. The No Action alternative was not selected because it would not provide the four additional sites needed to attain the desired number and spacing of treatment and control sites for Pacific Corp's effectiveness monitoring (EA, pg. 2).

SECTION 3 – PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The BLM solicited comments from affected tribal governments, adjacent landowners, affected State and local government agencies, and the general public on the East Fork Rock Creek In-stream Restoration EA, during a 30-day public comment period (May 27 – June 26, 2008). One comment was received as a result of the public comment period.

Upon reviewing the comments received, the following topics warrant additional clarification specific to the East Fork Rock Creek In-stream Restoration project: (1) purpose & need of project, (2) site selection, and (3) effects to the late seral stand.

1) Purpose & Need of Project

A comment was received that questioned the purpose and need of the project as to whether or not it was mitigation for the dam on Slide Creek.

The decision at hand is to approve or deny the placement of 25 logs in four sites on BLM administered lands within East Fork Rock Creek. The effectiveness monitoring study by PacificCorp is not a BLM project and is beyond the scope and jurisdiction of the Swiftwater Field Office, Roseburg District, BLM.

2) Site Selection

A comment asked why the sites in East Fork Rock Creek were chosen as the project location.

The four sites in East Fork Rock Creek were chosen because the effectiveness monitoring study design requires a more contiguous stream reach than is available on the adjacent private land. No other suitable stream reaches for this study exist in the Rock Creek drainage. Thus, it is necessary to place a relatively small portion of the project (four structure sites out of a total of 39 sites) on BLM-managed lands in order to get the desired number and spacing of treatment and control sites for a successful study (EA, pg. 2).

3) Effects to the Late Seral Stand

A comment questioned the apparent contradiction in the EA that on page 14 the EA states that "...it may take a century for [the plant community] to develop into the conifer-dominated plant community that once occupied the site" while on page 13 the EA states that the "...Forest Operations Inventory indicates the stand is 228 years old."

Based on Forest Operations Inventory data the overall stand surrounding the project is 228 years old but 1993 stream surveys documented the low volume of large woody debris within the stream channel and the low density of large riparian conifers within the channel recruitment zone (EA, pg. 13). The immediate, streamside vegetation is

comprised predominately of red alder, bigleaf maple, and vine maple with scattered conifers in the understory. It is this immediate, streamside vegetation that may take a century to develop into a conifer-dominated plant community even though it is within a larger stand that is 228 years old.

The remainder of the comments did not raise substantive issues that would influence my selection of the Alternative Two from the East Fork Rock Creek In-stream Restoration EA.

SECTION 4 – PROTEST PROCEDURES

The decision described in this document is a forest management decision and is subject to protest by the public. In accordance with Forest Management Regulations at 43 CFR § 5003 Administrative Remedies, protests of this decision may be filed with the authorized officer [Marci L. Todd] within 15 days of the publication date of the notice of decision in *The News-Review*, Roseburg, Oregon.

43 CFR § 5003.3 subsection (b) states that: “Protests shall be filed with the authorized officer and shall contain a written statement of reasons for protesting the decision.” This precludes the acceptance of electronic mail or facsimile protests. Only written and signed hard copies of protests that are delivered to the Roseburg District Office will be accepted. The protest must clearly and concisely state the reasons why the decision is believed to be in error.

Protests received more than 15 days after the first publication of the notice of decision are not timely filed and shall not be considered. Upon timely filing of a protest, the authorized officer shall reconsider the decision to be implemented in light of the statement of reasons for the protest and other pertinent information available to her. The authorized officer shall, at the conclusion of her review, serve her decision in writing to the protesting party. Upon denial of a protest the authorized officer may proceed with the implementation of the decision.

For further information, contact Marci L. Todd, Field Manager, Swiftwater Field Office, Roseburg District, Bureau of Land Management, 777 NW Garden Valley Blvd; Roseburg, OR. 97470, (541) 440-4931.

Marci L. Todd, Field Manager
Swiftwater Field Office

Date