

**Trinity River Channel Rehabilitation Sites: Bucktail  
(River Mile 105.3-106.35) and Lower Junction City (River Mile 78.8-79.8)**

---

**Final Environmental Assessment/Initial Study  
DOI-BLM CA-N060-2014-014-EA and TR-EA0114**

**April 2014**

**This document has been split into six parts to reduce the size of the document for distribution via the internet.**

**This is Part 6 of 6**

**A Table of Contents for the entire document is located at the beginning of Part 1.**

- Part 1: Document cover through Section 3.5: Water Quality (cover to page 78)**
- Part 2: Section 3.6: Fisheries through Section 6: References (page 78 to page 192)**
- Part 3: Appendix A: Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program**
- Part 4: Appendix B: Response to Comments part 1 (page B-1 to B-57)**
- Part 5: Appendix B: Response to Comments part 1 (page B-58 to end)**
- Part 6: Appendix C: Northwest Forest Plan Compliance Checklist**



**Appendix C**  
**Northwest Forest Plan Compliance Checklist**

This page left intentionally blank.

## Appendix C

### Northwest Forest Plan Compliance Checklist

#### ***Projects that Comply with the Pechman Exemptions.***

The Trinity River Channel Rehabilitation Sites: Bucktail (RM 105.3-106.35) and Lower Junction City (RM 78.8-79.8.) project is consistent with court orders relating to the Survey and Manage mitigation measure of the Northwest Forest Plan, as incorporated into the 1993 Redding Resource Management Plan.

On December 17, 2009, the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington issued an order in *Conservation Northwest, et al. v. Rey, et al.*, No. 08-1067 (W.D. Wash.) (Coughenour, J.), granting Plaintiffs' motion for partial summary judgment and finding a variety of NEPA violations in the BLM and USFS 2007 ROD eliminating the Survey and Manage mitigation measure. Judge Coughenour deferred issuing a remedy in his December 17, 2009 order until further proceedings, and did not enjoin the BLM from proceeding with projects. Plaintiffs and Defendants entered into settlement negotiations that resulted in the 2011 Survey and Manage Settlement Agreement, adopted by the District Court on July 6, 2011.

The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals issued an opinion on April 25, 2013, that reversed the District Court for the Western District of Washington's approval of the 2011 Survey and Manage Settlement Agreement. The case is now remanded back to the District Court for further proceedings. This means that the December 17, 2009, District Court order which found NEPA inadequacies in the 2007 analysis and records of decision removing Survey and Manage is still valid.

Previously, in 2006, the District Court (Judge Pechman) had invalidated the agencies' 2004 RODs eliminating Survey and Manage due to NEPA violations. Following the District Court's 2006 ruling, parties to the litigation had entered into a stipulation exempting certain categories of activities from the Survey and Manage standard (hereinafter "Pechman exemptions").

Judge Pechman's Order from October 11, 2006 directs: "Defendants shall not authorize, allow, or permit to continue any logging or other ground-disturbing activities on projects to which the 2004 ROD applied unless such activities are in compliance with the 2001 ROD (as the 2001 ROD was amended or modified as of March 21, 2004), except that this order will not apply to:

- A. Thinning projects in stands younger than 80 years old (emphasis added):
- B. Replacing culverts on roads that are in use and part of the road system, and removing culverts if the road is temporary or to be decommissioned;
- C. Riparian and stream improvement projects where the riparian work is riparian planting, obtaining material for placing in-stream, and road or trail decommissioning; and where the stream improvement work is the placement large wood, channel and floodplain reconstruction, or removal of channel diversions; and
- D. The portions of project involving hazardous fuel treatments where prescribed fire is applied.

Any portion of a hazardous fuel treatment project involving commercial logging will remain subject to the survey and management requirements except for thinning of stands younger than 80 years old under subparagraph a. of this paragraph."

Following the District Court's December 17, 2009 ruling, the Pechman exemptions still remained in place. The BLM has reviewed the Trinity River Channel Rehabilitation Sites: Bucktail (River Mile 105.3-106.35) and Lower Junction City (RM 78.8-79.8.) in consideration of both the December 17, 2009 partial summary judgment and Judge Pechman's October 11, 2006 order. Because the Trinity River Channel Rehabilitation Sites at Bucktail and Lower Junction City are riparian and stream improvement projects where the riparian work is riparian planting, obtaining material for placing in-stream, and road or trail decommissioning; and where the stream improvement work is the placement large wood, channel and floodplain reconstruction, or removal of channel diversions, the BLM has made the determination that this project meets Exemption C of

the Pechman Exemptions (October 11, 2006 Order), and therefore may still proceed even if the District Court sets aside or otherwise enjoins use of the 2007 Survey and Manage ROD since the Pechman exemptions would remain valid in such case.