

**UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
NORTHWEST OREGON DISTRICT OFFICE**

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

DOI-BLM-ORWA-N050-2017-0006-EA  
DOI-BLM-ORWA-N050-2018-0016-DNA

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) (DOI-BLM-ORWA-N050-2017-0006-EA) that analyzed the effects of two separate actions presented for analysis by the Upper Willamette Field Office, Northwest Oregon District Bureau of Land Management (BLM): 1) a regeneration timber harvest, named the Pedal Power Timber Sale; and b) a new non-motorized trail system for hiking and mountain biking. The BLM analyzed a No-Action Alternative and five action alternatives in the EA.

The BLM prepared a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for Alternative 3 on May 30, 2018, which included a regeneration harvest action followed by a trail development action. The BLM subsequently decided to implement a modification of Alternative 4 (Modified Alternative 4), which implements a) a regeneration harvest with approximately 15 percent green tree retention rather than 10 percent, resulting in a 100-acre regeneration harvest, and b) a trail development action unchanged from Alternative 4 in the EA. The BLM prepared a Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA) for the Modified Alternative 4 (DOI-BLM-ORWA-N050-2018-0016-DNA, DNA) and found that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed actions and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

On the basis of the information contained in the EA, the DNA, and all other information available to me, it is my determination that the implementation of the selected actions encompassed by the Modified Alternative 4 would not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment, considering the context and intensity of impacts (40 CFR 1508.27). Therefore, an environmental impact statement (EIS) is not necessary and will not be prepared.

This finding is based on my consideration of the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) criteria for significance (40 CFR 1508.27), with regard to both the context and to the intensity of the impacts as described in the EA and DNA.

**Brief Project Description**

The Selected Action is to implement Modified Alternative 4 as described and analyzed in the Thurston Hills Non-Motorized Trails and Forest Management Project EA (DOI-BLM-ORWA-N050-2017-0006-EA) and the Thurston Hills Non-Motorized Trails and Forest Management Project DNA (DOI-BLM-ORWA-N050-2018-0016-DNA). The BLM would implement a regeneration harvest per the management direction of the 2016 RMP for timber harvest in the Harvest Land Base (HLB) – Moderate Intensity Timber Area (MITA), and construction of non-motorized hiking and mountain biking trails in the Willamalane Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA).

Modified Alternative 4 would implement timber harvest prior to trail development, but would forego harvest on approximately 56 acres of HLB in the eastern portion of Section 1, where trails would be developed prior to a future timber harvest (EA p. 28).

Modified Alternative 4 includes one modification to the timber harvest: the regeneration harvest would implement approximately 15 percent green tree retention (based on pre-harvest basal area) rather than approximately 10 percent. The action would include all of the other management direction for regeneration harvest as described in the EA (p. 25). The harvest unit boundaries, the proposed haul roads, the road and culvert improvements, the harvest practices, harvest methods, post-harvest slash disposal, site preparation, reforestation activities, and project design features would all be the same as Alternative 4 (EA pp. 28-29). The timber harvest would be accomplished by two harvest methods including ground-based and cable (skyline) yarding. Associated actions would include road work and post-harvest slash disposal, site preparation, and reforestation, as described in the EA (pp. 26-29). Road work would include approximately 0.4 mile of road construction, 3.5 miles of road renovation, new cross-drains, and up to five (5) culverts at stream crossings. Similar to Alternative 4, the majority of the retention (approximately 70 percent) would be implemented in aggregates.

As a result of this modification, the harvest area would be approximately 100 acres rather than 105 acres, with approximately 11 acres of aggregate green trees (not included in the harvest area). Approximately half of the total aggregate retention would be placed along the south side of the regeneration harvest unit in Section 1, to provide visual screening of the harvest area from the adjacent Willamalane Park and Recreation District (WPRD) Thurston Hills property and to provide a forested corridor for BLM’s future trail in that location. The remaining retention would be dispersed within the harvest area. The timber volume generated would be approximately 4.0 million board feet (MMBF). The Modified Alternative 4 is shown on Figure 1. Differences between the Alternative 4 and the Modified Alternative 4 regeneration harvest proposals are shown in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Differences between the Alternative 4 and the Modified Alternative 4 regeneration harvest (Note: all data are approximations based on planning-level data)

	<b>Alternative 4 Regeneration Harvest (in EA)</b>	<b>Modified Alternative 4 Regeneration Harvest</b>
Total Harvest Unit Area (Acres)	111	111
Acres of Regeneration Harvest and Acres Converted to 0-10-yr Age Class	105	100
Green Tree Retention (percent of stand pre-harvest basal area)	10 %	15 %
Acres of Aggregate Retention	6	11
Timber Volume (MMBF)	4.2	4.0

The trail development action would be identical to Alternative 4 in the EA, described in the EA on page 28. The trail development action would develop approximately 8.5 miles of non-motorized hiking and mountain biking trails within the BLM's Willamalane Non-Motorized Trails Extensive Recreation Management Area (ERMA). The trail layout would have two potential connections to the adjacent hiking and mountain biking trail system being developed by the Willamalane Park and Recreation Department (WPRD) in the WPRD's Thurston Hills Natural Area. All trails would be open to hiking and mountain biking. However, to complement the WPRD trail system, the proposed BLM trails would be designed for primary use by mountain bikers, with secondary uses by hikers (including trail runners, joggers, and pedestrians). Trail layout, design, and construction of the trails would be guided by the International Mountain Bicycling Association (IMBA) trail design guidelines and BLM's *Guidelines to a Quality Trail Experience; Mountain Bike Trail Guidelines* (USDI BLM, 2017).

Both the timber harvest and the trail development actions include measures to avoid or minimize adverse environmental effects and ensure conformance with regulations, laws, and policies, as enumerated in the EA (Appendix B). These measures would apply to the Modified Alternative 4. Measures include adhering to RMP guidance, utilizing standard design practices, locating project activities in appropriate terrain, and incorporating Project Design Features (PDFs) and Best Management Practices (BMPs) (EA p. 20). The BLM would implement PDFs during design, layout, and construction of the proposed actions, through contract administration and monitoring.

The BLM anticipates implementing the Pedal Power Timber Sale over a two year period, probably beginning in 2018, and implementing the trail development actions as soon as the BLM has secured funding and trail construction can safely start in areas outside of, or subsequent to, timber harvest operations. The BLM anticipates that trail development would begin between 2019 and 2021, and may require up to five years to fund and construct the entire trail system.

## **Public Involvement**

The BLM provided numerous opportunities for meaningful public involvement on the Thurston Hills project and utilized public input during development of project alternatives and issues. The BLM solicited input on project alternatives and issues during early project scoping in April 2017 by way of a published scoping notice and a public meeting, and sent coordination letters to the Confederated Tribes of Siletz, the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde, and the Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs, inviting them to consult. The BLM held a second public meeting after identifying specific alternatives and issues for the EA in November 2017. The BLM posted these specific issues and alternatives on BLM's ePlanning website in November 2017. The BLM posted the EA and Preliminary Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) on April 23, 2018, for a 15-day public comment period ending May 8, 2018, during which 6 comment letters were received. The BLM prepared responses to substantive comments and included them in the May 30, 2018 Decision Record in Appendix A. The BLM added additional language and context to the EA as a result of public comments and internal review, and notified the public through the interested stakeholders list (by email) of its release on May 30, 2018. The additional language did not include additional analysis or change the conclusions of the EA. The modified Alternative 4 is essentially similar to the Alternative 4 identified as a project alternative for the

November 2017 public meeting and in the EA. The public and agencies had many opportunities to provide input on this alternative and its associated issues.

## **Context**

The selected actions are site-specific actions that by themselves do not have international, national, region-wide, or statewide importance. The actions described would be limited in scope and geographic application (40 CFR 1508.27(a)). The BLM described in the EA the project location (Section 1.0), the purpose and need (Section 1.2), and the affected environment (Chapter 3). The BLM analyzed and disclosed the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the selected actions for the issues analyzed in Chapter 3. The physical and biological effects are limited in scope and scale. The direct and indirect environmental effects would be confined to the project area. The BLM reviewed these analyses in consideration of the CEQ's guidance on cumulative effects analysis, and disclosed the results in the EA.

## **Conformity**

The BLM signed a Record of Decision (ROD) approving the Northwestern and Coastal Oregon Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan (2016 ROD/RMP) on August 5, 2016. The Upper Willamette Field Office designed this project to conform to the 2016 ROD/RMP, which is the governing RMP for this project. The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable RMP because it is specifically provided for in the following RMP decisions:

- The proposed harvest action is specifically provided for in the RMP because the underlying land use in the timber harvest areas is Harvest Land Base (HLB), and on HLB lands, the RMP directs the BLM to implement timber harvest activities in a manner that, repeated over time, results in a sustainable harvest level (RMP, p. 296).
- The proposed trail development action is provided for in the RMP because the RMP directs the BLM to *Manage Extensive Recreation Management Areas in accordance with their planning frameworks* (RMP, p.88), and the Willamalane ERMA planning framework specifically identifies the opportunity to connect BLM's future trail network in Sections 1 and 31 to a similar network of hiking and mountain biking trails on the adjoining WPRD lands (Willamalane ERMA Framework, p. 1).

## **Intensity**

I have considered the potential intensity of the impacts that would result from the selected action relative to each of the 10 areas required for consideration by the CEQ, as detailed below (40 C.F.R. § 1508.27(b)):

### **1. Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse.**

I considered both beneficial and adverse impacts associated with the selected action as presented in the Thurston Hills Non-Motorized Trails and Forest Management EA and DNA. As determined in the DNA, the analysis results for the Modified Alternative 4 are the same or similar to those of Alternative 4 as analyzed in the EA. DNA p. 6. Therefore, unless noted below, the EA results are directly applicable to the Modified Alternative 4.

The EA analyzed environmental effects from the project and presented six (6) issues not in detail in Section 1.6 and four (4) issues in detail in Section 3.

The EA concluded the following relative to potentially affected environmental resources and conditions:

**Fire Hazard:** As defined in the EA, fire hazard refers to the ease of ignition, potential fire behavior, and resistance to control of the fuel complex. EA p. 10. There would be no potential for significant effects from the proposed actions on fire hazard beyond those disclosed in the Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement for Western Oregon (PRMP/FEIS or FEIS). Trail development would not affect fire hazard because it would not change the structural stage, fuel model, or fuel loadings in the project area. Potential effects on fire hazard from timber harvest and reforestation activities are within the scope and scale of effects analyzed in the FEIS. Cumulatively, BLM's effects on fire hazard patterns within the Thurston Hills vicinity are diminished because fire hazard accrues from all landscape areas and this project would affect less than 1/2 of one percent of the landscape. EA p.10. Because the affected area would be so small, and represent such a small percentage of the landscape, there would be no significant impacts on fire hazard beyond those disclosed in the PRMP/FEIS.

**Fire Risk:** As defined in the EA, fire risk is the chance of a fire starting as determined by the presence and activity of causative agents. EA p. 11. The BLM analyzed the potential fire risk associated with residual activity fuels resulting from timber management activities in detail in the PRMP/FEIS, to which the EA tiers. For the Thurston Hills project, the BLM assessed the wildfire hazard potential (WFP) associated with timber harvest in the project area. Relative to fuel structure from residual activity fuel after harvest, the BLM utilized the methodology from the FEIS and found that, even under a high level of timber management activity, the resultant activity fuels risk category would remain low, similar to existing conditions. EA p. 11. The BLM also evaluated wildfire risk relative to trail development and use. The BLM considered the potential for increased ignition risk with the introduction of more people, including both the increase in people and the type of use as factors influencing human caused fires. EA p. 11. Since the recreational activities associated with fire starts (overnight camping, campfires, cooking fires) are not proposed by the trail development alternatives, the BLM does not anticipate the new recreational use to increased recreation-related fires. BLM's analysis, based on similar situations in Oregon where developed recreational users increased in outdoor areas, did not show that there would be an increase in fire occurrences. EA p. 12. Due to the change in how the public would use the land (from unmonitored diffuse activities to monitored developed recreation), the BLM anticipates no change or a decrease in fire risk in the project area such that effects on fire risk would be neutral or positive. EA pp.11-12. Overall, because the affected area would be so small, and represent such a small percentage of the landscape, there would be no significant impacts on fire risk beyond those disclosed in the PRMP/FEIS.

**Invasive Plants:** The BLM evaluated potential changes in invasive plants for the timber harvest action. The BLM would expect invasive plants to increase after harvest, with the increased levels persisting up to about 30 years, at which point planted conifers and other shade-tolerant native vegetation would outcompete (cause reductions in) invasive species.

Due to the current prevalence of weeds in the project area, BLM reforestation efforts after harvest would include proactive cutting back of invasive shrubs to promote growth of the planted seedlings. These extra efforts, in addition to the BLM's implementation of project design features (PDFs) and other monitoring and control actions described in the EA, would dampen the increase of invasive species, with rates of infestation remaining high after timber harvest, similar to existing conditions. EA pp. 13-14. Because conditions would not substantively change as a result of the proposed action, there would be no significant impacts from the action.

**Trespassing, Litter, Vagrancy, Privacy, Traffic, and Traffic Noise for Residences:** The BLM evaluated the effects of the selected trail development action on neighboring residences relative to trespassing, litter, vagrancy, privacy, traffic, and traffic noise. The BLM concluded that undesirable and criminal activities would not increase and may actually decrease in the project area as a result of trail development. EA pp. 14-15. Relative to privacy, three residences located where the trail corridor could not be rerouted farther away, would be potentially affected by noise or visual effects from trail users, with effects including audible noise such as the whirring of bicycle wheels, voices, and visual sightings of recreational users. Two of these residences are currently exposed to occasional noise and visual sightings of trail users on user-created trails. The third residence is set back from the trail and has screening vegetation on their property but the timber harvest action would remove trees near their property which could increase their exposure to the trail. The BLM, would incorporate aggregate green tree retention along the trail near this residence to provide a forested corridor for the trail to the extent possible. During and after trail construction, the BLM would implement a suite of management measures to enhance security through design, education, and enforcement. EA p. 15. Relative to traffic, the BLM trail development would not result in vehicular traffic on 79<sup>th</sup> Street because BLM is not proposing trail heads, parking facilities, or other amenities accessible from 79<sup>th</sup> Street or any other local roads. EA p. 16. Based on these considerations, the BLM does not anticipate the changes incurred by the trail development to cause significant impacts to neighboring residences. EA pp. 13-16.

**Mature and Late-successional Forest Characteristics and Effects on Spotted Owl:** The BLM previously analyzed effects on the amounts of late-successional forest structural stages and down woody material and the effects on spotted owl recovery in the PRMP/FEIS, to which this EA tiers. PRMP/FEIS pp. 307-337. The Thurston Hills project would be consistent with these effects because the proposed regeneration harvest follows RMP management direction, with features detailed in the EA Section 2.3.2. The affected stands would develop through the Early Successional, Stand Establishment, Young High Density, and Mature Multi-layered Canopy structural stages, as anticipated by the PRMP/FEIS (p. 318), before the BLM once again conducts harvest. There are no known spotted owl sites in the Thurston Hills project area. EA pp. 16-17. Because there are no northern spotted owl sites or designated critical habitat in the project area, there are no effects to the species or critical habitat from the proposed action. In addition, the 2016 RMP Final Environmental Impact Statement analyzed and disclosed the effects of a timber harvest regime on mature and late successional forest characteristics and their effects on northern spotted owls. This EA is tiered to that analysis. Because there are no effects beyond those disclosed by the FEIS, and no individuals of the species or any designated

critical habitat, there are no significant impacts to northern spotted owls or its habitat. EA pp. 16-17.

**Sediment Entering Streams:** The BLM previously analyzed effects of sediment yield from road construction in the PRMP/FEIS, to which this EA tiers. PRMP/FEIS pp. 401-409. For the Thurston Hills project, the BLM hydrologist conducted a quantitative analysis that included road construction, timber hauling, and trail building on sediment yields. The BLM concluded that the estimated increases in sediment yield from the Thurston Hills project would not be detectable relative to background sediment load. Neither road building and use, nor trail building and use, nor the combination of road/trail building and use would result in detectable changes in water quality. EA pp.18-19. Because there would be no detectable change, there would be no significant impact from sediment entering streams.

**Recreational Experiences:** The selected trail development action (identical to Alternative 4) would develop approximately 8.5 miles of new designated non-motorized, single-track trails within the ERMA. The trail network would offer a range of trail experiences (play, escape, challenge and efficiency) and provide for intermediate and advanced opportunities, with a variety of technical trail features including jumps, berms, grade reversals, and rollers on 12 distinct segments of trail. Trail width would be narrow (24-36 inches) across all trail segments, providing for a challenging and fun experience. When connected to and combined with the adjacent WPRD 12-mile system, the approximately 20 miles of the combined trail system would provide an additional recreational opportunity in the Eugene/Springfield area. EA pp. 36-38. Development of the trail system would follow the direction of the RMP, which anticipated its development. The BLM disclosed in the 2016 RMP, to which this EA is tiered, the effects of increasing the trail system in this area. Because these effects have already been disclosed in the 2016 RMP/FEIS (pp. 555-584), and there are no additional effects beyond those already disclosed, there are no significant impacts from this project.

**Timber Volume as Allowable Sale Quantity (ASQ):** The Modified Alternative 4 timber harvest action would contribute approximately 4.0 mmbf, representing approximately 7.5 percent of the Eugene SYU annual total ASQ target of 53 mmbf per year. DNA p. 6. Timber sales planned within the Eugene SYU for the years 2018-2023, including the Pedal Power sale, once implemented, would contribute to the ASQ volume. EA pp. 46-47. The 2016 RMP/FEIS and ROD established an ASQ, and disclosed the effects of offering that amount of timber volume for sale on a normal market. Because this project implements the decision made in the ROD, and does not have any effects beyond those disclosed in the 2016 RMP/FEIS, there are no significant impacts from this project.

**Forest Stand Age Class Distribution:** The Modified Alternative 4 timber harvest action would increase the 0-10 year age class by 100 acres and it would decrease the 70-year age class by 100 acres at the scale of both the Upper Willamette Field Office and the Eugene SYU. The Pedal Power harvest combined with other regeneration harvests in the Upper Willamette Field Office and the Eugene SYU would result in a trend of increased HLB acres in the 0-10 year age class. EA p. 49. Over time, acres in the 0-10 year age class would move into the 20-40 year age class, and successively into the 40-60 age class, for a more even distribution of ages across the age classes, as anticipated by the RMP. EA p. 49. The project changes in acreage associated with these age classes (whether measured in raw numbers or as a percentage) are very small relative to the Eugene SYU acreage. The 2016

RMP/FEIS analyzed and disclosed the effects of adjusting the age class distribution across the landscape. Because this project implements the decision made in the ROD, and does not have any effects beyond those disclosed in the 2016 RMP/FEIS (pp. 307-337), there are no significant impacts from this project.

**2. The degree to which the proposed action affects public health and safety.**

The selected trail development action would be neutral or beneficial for public health and safety, providing outdoor recreational opportunities associated with health benefits. Public safety associated with the trail development action was assessed through the issue of “trespassing, litter, vagrancy, privacy, traffic, and traffic noise”, and the BLM anticipates neutral or positive effects. EA pp. 14-16. The selected timber harvest action would be implemented following all OSHA safety regulations, such as: temporary road closures would be implemented on Road No. 18-2-1 (extension of 79<sup>th</sup> Street) during timber loading and road work to keep people at a safe distance from active operations (EA p. 27); and snags would not be created within falling distance of power lines, structures, roads, or trails that will remain open after harvest activities (EA p. 24). The BLM would continue to monitor and respond to public safety and would implement all necessary safety precautions during project implementation. Because the measures the BLM will implement during the project will maintain the public safety, and therefore there will be no change from the current conditions, there will be no significant impacts from this proposed action.

**3. Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity of historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.**

There are no unique characteristics of importance in the Thurston Hills project area. The BLM conducted a cultural resource inventory of the project area in July, 2017 and no cultural resources were identified. Because there are no resources that could be affected by this project, there are no significant impacts.

**4. The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.**

CEQ guidelines relating to controversy refer not to the amount of public opposition or support for a project, but to a substantial dispute as to the size, nature, or effect of the action. The effects of activities planned under the selected actions are similar to many other trail development and timber harvest projects of a similar size and type implemented by the BLM. There is no unique or appreciable scientific controversy regarding the effects of the project. Because there is no substantial dispute as to the size, nature, or effect of the action, and therefore there is no controversy, there is no significant impact from this proposed action.

**5. The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.**

The selected actions would not impose highly uncertain impacts or involve unique or unknown risks to the human environment. The effects of activities planned under the selected action are similar to many other trail development and timber harvest projects of a similar size and type implemented by the BLM. The risks are well known and understood, and are therefore not significant under this factor.

**6. The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.**

This project neither establishes a precedent nor represents a decision in principle about future actions. The selected trail development action is consistent with the BLM management direction for recreational facilities, would not cause significant environmental effects, and would not establish a precedent for future recreation actions with significant effects. The selected timber harvest action is consistent with the BLM management direction for forest management, would not cause significant environmental effects, and would not establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects. Neither action is therefore significant under this factor.

**7. Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.**

The BLM evaluated the project in context of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions and determined that there is no potential for significant cumulative effects. The BLM identified that the selected actions would have local and regional positive cumulative effects relative to recreational opportunities, timber volumes (in ASQ), and forest age class distribution. These effects would be consistent with the local and regional settings considered in the analyses.

The EA considered other reasonably foreseeable actions for the issues analyzed in detail. The selected trail action would provide a new recreational opportunity in the Eugene/Springfield area as anticipated by the RMP, and in combination with the current and future WPRD trail system, would provide a well-constructed and sustainable local recreational facility into the future. EA pp. 36-38.

The selected timber harvest action would provide for approximately 3.2 million board feet of ASQ, which would be combined with other timber sales in the Eugene Sustained Yield Unit (SYU) to provide enough timber volume to meet the annual ASQ targets for the Eugene SYU (53 mmbf per year). DNA p. 6 and EA p. 47. The timber harvest action would redistribute approximately 100 acres into the 0-10 year forest age class, and, combined with future harvests, would cause a more even distribution of ages across the age classes, as anticipated by the RMP as a means to provide sustained yield harvest levels. DNA p. 6 and EA p.49. These would have beneficial cumulative effects relative to BLM's ability to manage forests for sustained yield, as anticipated by the PRMP/FEIS.

**8. The degree to which the action may adversely affect 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 historic resources.**

The selected action would not affect any cultural resources listed in or deemed eligible or potentially eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. The BLM conducted surveys in 2017 and no cultural resources were identified in the project area. EA p. 9. Because there are no resources that could be affected by this action, there are no significant impacts from this action.

9. **The degree to which the action 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 (ESA).**

There are no species listed or proposed for listing under the ESA in the project area, and no designated or proposed to be designated critical habitat in the project area. EA p. 16 and p. 50. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effects to such species or their crucial habitat, and therefore, there are no significant effects.

10. **Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.**

The selected action does not violate or threaten to violate any Federal, State, or local laws imposed for the protection of the environment.

Pursuant to Executive Order 13212, the BLM must consider the effects of this decision on the President's National Energy Policy. As there would be no impact to the exploration, development, or transportation of undeveloped energy sources from the selected action, a Statement of Adverse Energy Impacts is not required.

**Conclusion**

Based on the information contained in the EA (DOI-BLM-ORWA-N050-2017-0006-EA), the DNA (DOI-BLM-ORWA-N050-2018-0016-DNA), and all other information available to me, I have determined that the selected actions would not have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment within the meaning of section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and that an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. In addition, I have determined that the effects of the proposed activities would be in conformance with the management direction of the 2016 Record of Decision/Resource Management Plan for the Northwest Oregon District.

Signature of the Responsible Official:

/s/ Michael Kinsey

Michael Kinsey  
Upper Willamette Field Manager  
Northwest Oregon District Office

August 15, 2018

Date