

Worksheet
Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

Note: This worksheet is to be completed consistent with the policies stated in the Instruction Memorandum entitled "Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Adequacy" transmitting this worksheet and the "Guidelines for Using the DNA Worksheet" located at the end of the worksheet. *(Note: The signed CONCLUSION at the end of this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal analysis process and does not constitute an appealable decision.)*

A. BLM Office: Klamath Falls Field Office **Lease/Serial/Case File No.** _____

Proposed Action Title/Type: Paving of existing Trail at Wood River Wetland

Location of Proposed Action: T34S, R71/2E, Sec 25 & 26

Description of the Proposed Action: Upgrade the existing 0.5 mile nature trail from a crushed rock surface to asphalt pavement. The trail bed would be prepared by weeding, smoothing and compacting the crushed rock base, and a 2" lift of bituminous asphalt would be applied. All work would be done under contract administered by BLM-KFRA personnel. This upgrade would make the trail more universally accessible to those who use wheelchairs or other mobility aids and would make maintenance of weeds and brush on and adjacent to the trail tread significantly easier.

Applicant (if any): _____

B. Conformance with one or more of the following Land Use Plans (LUPs) and/or Related Subordinate Implementation Plans:

Name/Date of Plans:

*Wood River Wetland RMP/ EIS

Date Approved 11/21/95

*List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans or applicable amendments).

**List applicable activity, project, management, water quality restoration, or program plans.

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

Page 3-24 of the Wood River Wetland RMP/EIS, under the Recreation heading, states that development of recreation facilities could include "improved(graveled or paved) parking areas and roads, toilets, interpretive signing, nature trails...."

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms,

and conditions) and, if applicable, implementation plan decisions:

N/A

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

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

Upper Klamath Basin and Wood River Wetland Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan (Wood River Wetland RMP/EIS).

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., source drinking water assessments, biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, rangeland health standard's assessment and determinations, and monitoring the report).

The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA; PL 101-336)

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

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

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes- The Wood River Wetland RMP/EIS Record Of Decision (page 3-24- 3-26) specifically mentions the development of recreation facilities including nature trails in roaded natural and semi-primitive settings.

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?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes- The Wood River RMP/EIS, evaluated and analyzed four different alternatives, covering a wide range of levels of development for existing and potential recreation sites. The level of development proposed in this action is within the scope and range as described in the preferred alternative. The following current issues and concerns were addressed within the range of alternatives: Meeting public demand for recreation opportunities within the planning area, improving universal accessibility to recreation facilities and opportunities, and develop the area to enhance its use for environmental education and interpretation of wetland environments.

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 condition [PFC] reports; rangeland health standards assessments; Unified Watershed Assessment categorizations; inventory and monitoring data; most recent Fish and Wildlife 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?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The existing analysis is valid, the proposal has been reviewed by staff specialists and interdisciplinary team members for any new information and circumstances.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The Wood River Wetland RMP/EIS was reviewed and completed by staff specialists working together in an interdisciplinary team setting. Interdisciplinary team analysis was conducted using standards and guidelines as provided by BLM OR/WA State Office instructions.

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?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The direct and indirect impacts of the proposed action are essentially the same as those considered by staff specialists who evaluated the Recreation program section under various alternatives in the Final RMP/EIS. The RMP/EIS evaluated site specific impacts of managing and maintaining existing recreation sites as well as potential new recreation developments.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The cumulative impacts that would result from the proposed action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the Wood River Wetland RMP/EIS.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The Wood River Wetland RMP/EIS planning effort incorporated substantial opportunities for public input and interagency review during the various stages of plan development. Local meetings were held to answer questions, consider and incorporate public comments, including those for the recreation resource section proposals.

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

| <u>Name</u> | <u>Title</u> | <u>Resource Represented</u> |
|-------------------------|--|-----------------------------|
| <u>Grant Weidenbach</u> | <u>Park Ranger</u> | <u>Outdoor Recreation</u> |
| <u>Wedge Watkins</u> | <u>Wood River Wetland Project Mgr.</u> | <u>Wetland Restoration</u> |
| <u>Gayle Sitter</u> | <u>Wildlife Biologist</u> | <u>Wildlife</u> |
| <u>Scott Senter</u> | <u>Outdoor Recreation Planner</u> | <u>Outdoor Recreation</u> |
| <u>Lou Whiteaker</u> | <u>Botanist</u> | <u>Botany</u> |

F. Mitigation Measures: List any applicable mitigation measures that were identified, analyzed, and approved in relevant LUPs and existing NEPA document(s). List the specific mitigation measures or identify an attachment that includes those specific mitigation measures. Document that these applicable mitigation measures must be incorporated and implemented.

The Wood River Wetland RMP/EIS Appendix B, page B-18 under Activity Planning and Design, states that the following should be applied to mitigate water quality impacts; “-Surface all roads, -Pull back sidecast from road construction...”

Page B-38, Recreation and Off-Highway Vehicles, under Practices, (4) states “Design facilities to concentrate and direct foot and vehicular traffic to reduce impacts. Apply site-hardening measures appropriate for the level of designated development.

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 constitutes BLM’s compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

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

/s/ Teresa A. Raml
Signature of the Responsible Official

08/08/01
Date