

4.0 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

4.1 Introduction

The Bureau of Reclamation and Douglas County have attempted to involve all concerned Federal, State, and local agencies as well as the public throughout the data gathering and analysis processes. Early in the planning process, several issues of concern were raised, and as the process developed, other issues became known. This process has been followed, concerns were addressed as they arose, and all appropriate data were considered in formulating the County's preferred alternative (Table 4-1). In addition, environmental commitments were developed (See: Appendix B). The following discussions summarize the record of consultation, coordination, and public involvement and how the activities were used in the decisions and planning of the project.

Agencies involved in the environmental process include the Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, Bureau of Land Management, and Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. The Fish and Wildlife Service prepared a Coordination Act Report and reviewed the Bureau of Reclamation's Status Report and Environmental Analysis. Fish and Wildlife Service comments on the latter and Bureau report of Reclamation responses are in Appendix C.

Contacts made for recreation planning included the Oregon Department of Transportation (Parks and Recreation Division) and the Douglas County Parks Department. Contacts regarding historic and cultural resources included the State Historic Preservation Office and the Douglas County Museum. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers participated in flood studies by reviewing study work and preparing the economic analysis. The Bureau of Land Management was consulted on right-of-way issues on land it manages and is a cooperating agency in preparing this EIS. Consultation with the Bureau of Mines was initiated to obtain an evaluation of the potential for commercial recovery of minerals in and near the project area. The Soil Conservation Service conducted soil classification surveys on the service areas and on the project "take" lands, including the reservoir area. The Geological Survey was consulted regarding ground water availability and quality and ground water movement in the subbasin. The Oregon Department of Environmental Quality was notified of the proposed project and provided information. The state of Oregon A-95 Clearing House Process also was utilized (See: Appendix D).

This Section is a chronological summary of consultation and coordination on the following issues:

- Public Involvement
- Water Quality

Table 4-1. Environmental Concerns and Action Taken to Evaluate Concerns for the Proposed Milltown Hill Project.

RESOURCE	CONCERN	ACTION TAKEN TO EVALUATE CONCERNS
Agriculture	Determine acres of agricultural land and Prime and Unique farmlands that would be lost by inundation of the reservoir. Determine location of existing and potential irrigable lands in the service areas.	Conduct soil surveys and land capability classification in the service area and reservoir area to determine acres of Prime and Unique farmlands. Design an irrigation system and schedule which would alleviate present water shortages during irrigation season. Develop water release schedule which would provide for optimum use on irrigable lands.
Air Quality	Determine if construction and operation of the project would adversely affect regional air quality standards.	Obtain federal and state air quality standards, determine if the project is located in a Class I region.
Climate	Identify climatological factors which would affect project construction and operation.	Obtain climatological data, including temperature, rainfall, snowfall, flood patterns.
Commercial Timber	Determine extent of commercial timber resources to be affected by the project.	Survey timber resources within project take line to determine timber ownership, condition, volume and value. Estimate timber-producing lands which would be irretrievably lost due to project construction.
Cultural Resources	Possible inundation of significant historic and prehistoric resources.	Conduct literature search of documented prehistoric and historic activities and structures. Conduct a Class III survey within the project take line. Assess results. Conduct test excavations of several known archeological sites and other probable sites. Consult with SHPO to determine site significance. Develop mitigative measures on sites which would be affected by the project.

F: EVALUATE

Table 4-1, continued.

RESOURCE	CONCERN	ACTION TAKEN TO EVALUATE CONCERNS
Fisheries	<p>Dam would block upstream movement of anadromous fish and cause the loss of habitat on 4 miles of mainstem and 2 miles of tributaries for anadromous and resident game and non-game species. Slightly lower project flows than during pre-project winter and spring high flow period.</p> <p>Higher flows of cooler water than during pre-project summer and fall low flow periods.</p> <p>Lower summer water temperatures may affect the habitat of the Umpqua Chub, a Special Status Species</p>	<p>Conduct fisheries and habitat surveys of Elk Creek. Conduct instream flow studies (IFIM) in Elk Creek. Do reservoir modelling to predict water temperatures and flow releases.</p> <p>Do stream temperature modelling to predict water temperature downstream from the reservoir. Analyze stream temperature modelling to determine if project flow temperature would be critical to fish species.</p> <p>Develop enhancement plan for coho, winter steelhead and fall chinook.</p> <p>Develop monitoring plan to evaluate water temperature and enhancement.</p>
Flood Control	<p>Will the project help control periodic flooding in lower Elk Creek.</p>	<p>Estimate possible flood levels at Drain resulting from operation of the project.</p>
Geology, Seismicity	<p>Determine geologic and seismic integrity of damsite and reservoir area.</p>	<p>Research literature and previous studies in area. Investigate damsite foundation to determine rock weathering, jointing, permeability, depth of overburden. Determine subsurface conditions. Conduct seismotectonic study of the area.</p>
Ground Water Availability	<p>Assess local ground water availability, to determine if ground water could be developed as a feasible alternative to the proposed project.</p>	<p>Search records to determine yield of existing wells, examine geological conditions to assess ground water storage capabilities.</p>
Land Use	<p>Conversion of an agriculturally oriented valley to a water storage reservoir.</p>	<p>Determine if this irretrievable action can be mitigated.</p>
Mineral and Aggregate Resource	<p>Determine if the proposed project would affect the mineral and aggregate resources in the project area.</p>	<p>Bureau of Mines conducted a literature search of existing and past mining activities, and areas having mineral and aggregate resources.</p>

F: EVALUATE

Fisheries

Most of the fishery activity in 1987 involved instream flow studies. The reader is referred to the instream flow section for a discussion of those activities.

Wildlife

Discussions continued on mitigation concepts. The idea of developing wetlands in a sub-impoundment at the upper end of the reservoir pool was discussed, and ODFW, FWS, and BR toured the Fern Ridge wildlife area to view management practices potentially relevant to the wetland concept. Due to the lack of unique habitat in the reservoir area, the ODFW regional office in Roseburg, FWS, Douglas County, and BR agreed that negotiating a mitigation package was possible. The ODFW regional office identified some lands that they would consider as possible mitigation for the reservoir. In December, the FWS presented BR and Douglas County with a draft copy of a wildlife mitigation plan.

Cultural Resources

BR received the Douglas County Museum's final report. It awarded a contract to Heritage Research Associates, Inc. for a Class I Survey of the potential reservoir area.

Recreation

In July, BR and ODFW met with Douglas County Parks Department personnel to discuss recreation concepts, particularly as related to wildlife mitigation. The Parks Department subsequently met with the Douglas County Water Resources Survey to discuss recreation planning and land acquisition for recreation at the Milltown Hill site.

1988

Public Involvement

Douglas County conducted an interest survey of potential water users in the area of the gravity pressure pipeline. Douglas County mailed out questionnaires to all those on the tax rolls owning property in the pipeline service area asking if they would be very interested in purchasing water, moderately interested, or not interested. Of the 310 mailings, the County received 302 responses. Of those who responded, 56 percent were very interested, 25 percent moderately

Table 4-1, continued.

RESOURCE	CONCERN	ACTION TAKEN TO EVALUATE CONCERNS
Surface Water Quality.	Determine if existing surface water quality meets the EPA criteria for drinking water and irrigation.	Obtain surface water quality data from Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. Obtain samples of surface water from Elk Creek to determine mercury content. Evaluate stability of mine tailings. Determine locations of major discharges of domestic waste water. Model reservoir water temperatures to determine temperatures of release water. Model downstream change in water temperature under project operations. Prepare application for Section 401 certification and submit to DEQ.
Surface Water Quantity	Determine if anticipated water yield would meet the water demand in the service area. Determine if County can provide at least 5,000 acre-feet of storage for fish enhancement.	Estimate water needs of potential rural and urban users. Estimate monthly and annual water yield of the impoundment.
Timber	How much commercial timber land, volume, and value would be affected by the project.	Determine commercial timber acres, volume and value inundated by the project. Determine commercial timber acres, volume and value to be affected within the project take-line.
Topography	Provide accurate topographic data and elevations for design information.	Obtain aerial photography to develop topographic maps at 1" = 100 ft, with 10-ft contour interval, conduct land surveys.
Trace Elements	Will the reservoir develop concentrations of mercury unsafe for public drinking water and public consumption of fish.	Assess mercury concentration in Lane Creek and Elk Creek near the Elkhead Mine. Determine if geologic formations in the reservoir area would expose high levels of cinnabar. Locate and map mine tailings in relation to reservoir take-line.
Transportation	Would construction and operation of the project affect existing transportation conditions.	Estimate current vehicle traffic on County Roads #7 and 8. Estimate need to relocate roads due to project construction. Estimate vehicle traffic during construction and operation of the project.

F: EVALUATE

Table 4-1, continued.

RESOURCE	CONCERN	ACTION TAKEN TO EVALUATE CONCERNS
Vegetation	Determine types and extent of vegetation which would be inundated by the project. Determine extent of wetlands which would be affected by the project. Identify T&E plant species.	Field type and calculate acreages of vegetative types. Identify wetlands. Field check reservoir area and service areas for T&E plant species.
Visual Resource	Changes in visual quality of a portion of Elk Creek valley occupied by the reservoir.	Develop recreation sites with landscaped features. Landscape realigned roads, causeways.
Wetlands	Do jurisdictional wetlands exist in the project area.	Soil Conservation Service, Fish and Wildlife Service surveyed the project area. The agencies recommended actions to mitigate any loss or degradation of wetlands.
Wildlife	Determine the impacts of the project on wildlife and their habitat. Determine if T&E Species (Columbian White-tailed Deer, Northern Spotted Owl, Bald Eagle) would be effected.	Identify species of wildlife most likely to be affected by reservoir inundation. Determine extent of habitat loss due to reservoir inundation. Develop measures to mitigate impacts to wildlife, both on-site and off-site. Survey the area surrounding the project to determine the existence of the spotted owl. Develop methodology for protecting Columbian white-tailed deer.

F: EVALUATE

- Flood Control
- Environmental Coordination
- Threatened and Endangered Species
- Fisheries
- Instream Flows
- Stream Temperature
- Wildlife
- Wetlands
- Cultural Resources
- Recreation

4.2 Chronology of Consultation and Coordination

1985

Public Involvement

On November 26, the Douglas County Commission and Bureau Reclamation (BR) signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) initiating Northern Douglas County Cooperative Water Resources Study. The study covered the need of further exploring potential damsites in the Calapooya and Elk Creek subbasins in northern Douglas County. The MOU defined each agency's role in the study. A multidisciplinary team was formed which included staff members from both agencies. A plan for the study was formulated. Each team member was assigned one or more environmental or engineering components of the study. Each member would develop an "appendix" which would be incorporated into an environmental assessment of the project.

The signing occurred at a public meeting of the commission. The Commissioners and BR held a short press conference in conjunction with the signing. BR mailed the notice of initiation of the study to the media, federal and state agencies, and groups with a known interest in BR activities. Responses to the notice of initiation were received from the Oregon Water Resources Department (WRD), Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development, and the Douglas County Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD).

Flood Control

Upon receipt of BR's notice of initiation of a study in Elk Creek, the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development contacted BR expressing its concern over flooding along Elk Creek. The agency offered its records for the flood control analysis.

Upon receipt of BR's notice of initiation of a study in Elk

Creek, the SWCD contacted BR to express its concerns over flooding problems along Elk Creek. The SWCD noted that it was involved in flood control activity along Elk Creek.

Environmental Coordination

In December, BR conducted an orientation trip for Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW), and Bureau of Land Management (BLM). Shortly after the trip, BR requested a planning aid letter (PAL) from the FWS for input into a preliminary findings memorandum (PFM).

Instream Flows

The SWCD responded to the notice of study initiation by stating its concern over the need to improve instream flows in Elk Creek to benefit irrigation, fish, and wildlife.

1986

Public Involvement

Douglas County held a public information meeting on January 7 in Drain. The County discussed the study, however most of the comments from local residents involved SWCD flood control activities along Elk Creek in Drain.

Water Quality

Naturally occurring deposits of heavy metals are common in portions of Douglas County, including the Elk Creek basin. Of particular concern to the project is the abandoned Elkhead Cinnabar Mine near the east edge of the reservoir site. BR met with the mine caretaker in the early spring to tour the mine area and make arrangements for future access, if needed. BR identified sampling sites on this tour. Water samples were subsequently taken from the mine area and immediately downstream from the mine site.

In the summer, BR contacted the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) regarding wastewater treatment facilities in the basin and the potential for using project releases to reduce treatment costs. This potential was very minimal.

In the late summer, BR and the County determined that fish tissue sampling for mercury and other heavy metals would help

answer the question regarding contamination from the Elkhead Mine. The County consulted with ODFW and FWS on this approach.

Flood Control

Douglas County consulted with Corps of Engineers (Corps) regarding flood control data and analysis needed for the Elk Creek studies. Contacts were with study staff involved with a potential storage project in southern Douglas County. BR also contacted the Corps regarding flood analysis on Elk Creek. Comparison of discussions indicated that the County and BR were dealing with two different parts of the Corps' organization. BR sent a formal request for assistance to the Corps in November asking for a flood control benefit analysis.

FWS, Douglas County, and BR visited the confluence of Billy Creek and Elk Creek in December to look at a reported problem with the flow of Billy Creek that increased flooding in Drain. The field review identified potential wildlife impacts from re-routing the Billy Creek outflow.

Environmental Coordination

ODFW and FWS worked on the input needed for the PFM. The FWS sent the draft PFM to BR on March 29.

BR received a notification from BLM of its Resource Management Planning activity in the Elk Creek area in September. BR sent a letter requesting consultation on its planning.

BR requested a planning aid letter (PAL) from the FWS with a completion time in the fall of 1986. The County provided photo and mapping for the PAL. BR received the PAL in December.

Instream Flow

Douglas County provided previously performed instream flow results to NMFS and FWS. Review by these agencies indicated a need to perform new instream flow studies. Further discussions in a joint meeting indicated that the basic Instream Flow Incremental Methodology (IFIM) data had been recorded in a modified method, and the data would be suitable if it were reworked to a more suitable format. The agencies hoped to rerun the IFIM studies using the available data, but a check showed that the original computer files were destroyed and rerunning the model would require recoding and reentering the data. The fishery agencies provided a tentative set of

instream flows based on the available IFIM analysis in the FWS PAL of December 8.

Discussions in June with WRD indicated the state had never assigned economic benefits to improved instream flows for water quality purposes. WRD indicated that the Water Resources Commission would support storage for providing minimum flows in Douglas County.

Threatened and Endangered Species

FWS provided BR with a list of Threatened and Endangered Species.

Stream Temperatures

It was decided that stream temperature projections for Elk Creek would be done by extrapolating current temperature data from the Galesville project, since the only temperature readings on Elk Creek were taken at the Elkhead gage, located 1 mile downstream from the Milltown Hill site. Douglas County provided the Galesville data to FWS.

Wildlife

The FWS prepared a planning aid memo (PAM) on April 29 for BR's preliminary findings memorandum of May 15. The PAM prepared provisional concepts of impacts and potential mitigation to wildlife, as a result of construction and operation of the reservoir. Douglas County and FWS met late in the year to discuss mitigation concepts.

Cultural Resources

The Douglas County museum prepared a report on historical and cultural resources in the study area. The report included an inventory of standing structures that might be eligible for listing in the National Register. This report provided background for the Class I Survey.

Recreation

BR met with Douglas County Parks Department staff regarding recreation problems and needs in the study area. The county agreed that despite current SCORP projections, construction of a reservoir in the Milltown Hill area would result in increased recreation use.

1987

Public Involvement

BR briefed the Umpqua Water Resources Development Association on June 25 regarding the study. At a public meeting in Sutherlin on August 18, a member of the Douglas County Commission predicted that the reservoir at Milltown Hill would begin filling in 1991. The County held public meetings on December 16 with the Water Advisory Committee and the Umpqua Water Resources Development Association.

Water Quality

In early winter, the FWS agreed to have its laboratory perform the fish tissue sampling. However, internal contacts within the FWS indicated that the samples would not receive the rapid processing that the study needed. As a result, the FWS agreed to split the fish tissue sample and allow the County to contract an analysis on half the sample with the Umpqua Research Laboratory. ODFW and the FWS collected the fish tissue samples. Douglas County provided laboratory results to ODFW in late July. BR provided the results to FWS in early August.

Flood Control

The Corps responded to BR's request in January. The Corps promised a scope of work that would allow them to review the county flood reduction analysis and prepare an estimate of benefits. The Corps' scope of work arrived in February. Douglas County sent a letter to the Corps in March asking that they provide the needed assistance in the flood control study.

Douglas County provided the Corps with flood control data that it had gathered based on its earlier discussions with the Corps. The Corps reviewed the data and determined that additional data was needed. The Corps outlined the data needs and completed the study. Douglas County performed field work to survey structures and perform flood routing studies. BR provided flood routing studies through the proposed reservoir. Douglas County contracted with a consulting firm to complete the survey of structures.

Environmental Coordination

Most of the direct coordination involved technical analysis in other parts of this section of the report. BR informed FWS that it would be wanting analysis of two reservoir sizes at the Milltown Hill site.

Instream Flows

In the spring, BR, ODFW, and FWS met to discuss the tentative set of instream flows. The flows appeared too high considering the basin's hydrologic capability. The agencies decided that additional flow studies were needed and that providing flows for fall chinook should be eliminated. Subsequent discussions suggested that the IFIM be rerun using the existing data if possible. Douglas County agreed to contract for a reanalysis of the IFIM studies. The FWS provided language assistance to the County in preparing a scope of work for the IFIM reanalysis. Douglas County selected Campbell-Craven Environmental Consultants to perform the analysis.

ODFW reviewed the cross-section locations used in the IFIM study and confirmed that they were representative. The hydrologic record was extended for the IFIM study and with-project flows for reservoirs sized at 36,000 and 50,000 acre-feet were provided to the consultant. The agencies decided to eliminate small mouth bass and cutthroat trout from the analysis but to include fall chinook at a future time. A field trip was held in September to confirm transect weightings.

The agencies met again in the fall to discuss the progress of the IFIM re-analysis. ODFW, NMFS, and FWS helped Douglas County consultant select site specific suitability curves for Elk Creek. The group agreed to use the one-flow technique and to have the County perform a field review of Elk Creek habitat with the intent of dividing one of the reaches into two. ODFW, NMFS, and FWS chose the substrate coding for use in the modeling. The group decided to reduce the period of record to 30 years to use daily rather than monthly means in the modeling. Douglas County consultant re-ran the IFIM with the new data and the agencies met again in the fall to review the model output.

Threatened and Endangered Species

In June, BR made a request for a list of threatened and endangered species. The FWS responded that the list provided in the 1986 planning aid memorandum was still valid. BR then prepared a biological assessment in which it determined that the project would not adversely impact either bald eagles or Columbian white-tailed deer.

Fisheries

Most of the fishery activity in 1987 involved instream flow studies. The reader is referred to the instream flow section for a discussion of those activities.

Wildlife

Discussions continued on mitigation concepts. The idea of developing wetlands in a sub-impoundment at the upper end of the reservoir pool was discussed, and ODFW, FWS, and BR toured the Fern Ridge wildlife area to view management practices potentially relevant to the wetland concept. Due to the lack of unique habitat in the reservoir area, the ODFW regional office in Roseburg, FWS, Douglas County, and BR agreed that negotiating a mitigation package was possible. The ODFW regional office identified some lands that they would consider as possible mitigation for the reservoir. In December, the FWS presented BR and Douglas County with a draft copy of a wildlife mitigation plan.

Cultural Resources

BR received the Douglas County Museum's final report. It awarded a contract to Heritage Research Associates, Inc. for a Class I Survey of the potential reservoir area.

Recreation

In July, BR and ODFW met with Douglas County Parks Department personnel to discuss recreation concepts, particularly as related to wildlife mitigation. The Parks Department subsequently met with the Douglas County Water Resources Survey to discuss recreation planning and land acquisition for recreation at the Milltown Hill site.

1988

Public Involvement

Douglas County conducted an interest survey of potential water users in the area of the gravity pressure pipeline. Douglas County mailed out questionnaires to all those on the tax rolls owning property in the pipeline service area asking if they would be very interested in purchasing water, moderately interested, or not interested. Of the 310 mailings, the County received 302 responses. Of those who responded, 56 percent were very interested, 25 percent moderately

interested, and 0.6 percent thought the project was a bad idea.

A Water Advisory Board meeting was held in Yoncalla in December. The study status was discussed as were the results of the interest survey and Douglas County's update of its Water Plan.

Flood Control

BR mailed the last of the hydrologic data to the Corps in July. The Corps checked the hydrologic studies and completed the economic analysis. The Corps presented its analysis in December.

Environmental Coordination

In April, the FWS sent BR a draft planning aid memorandum (PAM) and a mitigation plan for Milltown Hill. BR, ODFW, Douglas County, and FWS discussed the concepts presented in the PAM. The PAM provided the initial discussion point for preparing the final mitigation plan.

Fisheries

The agencies began discussing a methodology for deriving fish benefits from the IFIM studies. Consultations between Douglas County's consultant, Campbell-Craven Environmental Consultants, who performed the IFIM studies and ODFW resulted in an agreement to use a habitat quality index for deriving benefits. The County's benefit analysis was sent to the cooperating agencies for review in March.

Instream Flows

Douglas County consultant prepared a final report on the IFIM study. Both the FWS and ODFW provided written comments on the report. At this point, the agencies had agreed upon the instream flows. The issue of temperature remained to ensure that the extra flows would provide improved habitat.

Stream Temperatures

Douglas County contracted with Campbell-Craven Environmental Consultants to review temperature operations at Galesville as part of the Galesville monitoring program. The consultant found that Corps of Engineers modelling of Galesville did not

agree with observed reservoir or release temperatures. This concerned the consultant regarding use of extrapolation of Galesville temperatures to Elk Creek.

Wildlife

ODFW, the County, and BR met to discuss the draft wildlife mitigation plan. At this meeting, the state ODFW office expressed its desire for using the Habitat Evaluation Procedure (HEP) and onsite mitigation. Due to the nature of the habitat at the reservoir site, the agencies agreed that a modified HEP was appropriate. A HEP team was formed, and the HEP field work was performed in the fall by FWS, ODFW, and Douglas County.

Cultural Resources

BR received Heritage Research Associates' draft final report on the Class I Survey.

1989

Public Involvement

Douglas County conducted 8 water advisory board meetings in 1989, and the Milltown Hill project was an agenda topic in each of them. One meeting was held in Drain on February 15. About 70 local residents attended and participated in a question and answer session on the project. The board held another meeting in Yoncalla on December 20. Topics at the meeting included the irrigated land base around Yoncalla and procedures for purchasing properties needed for the reservoir. Several residents in the reservoir area wanted to sell their property and wanted the process to move more rapidly.

The Business and Industry Section Joint Chambers of Commerce held a "Project Leadership" meeting on December 14. The Milltown Hill project was discussed for about 30 minutes.

Water Quality

BR and Douglas County decided that additional mercury analysis was needed to define the extent of possible contamination from the Elkhead Mine. A series of sites were selected for soil sampling and subsequent analysis of heavy metals. The U.S. Geological Survey laboratory in Denver, Colorado performed the analyses for BR.

Prime and Unique Farmlands

The Soil Conservation Service, in compliance with the Farmland Protection Act, Public Law 97-98, conducted a soil survey upstream of the damsite. Subsequently, the Soil Conservation Service provided a list of soils. Based on the soil map, 115 acres of prime farmlands were identified, no unique farmlands were identified.

1992

Public Involvement

Public Hearings

January 20, 1992 Public Hearing, Drain, Oregon. A total of 30 people attended this meeting. After the Bureau of Reclamation explained that the purpose of the meeting was to accept oral or written comments on the adequacy of the DEIS, 6 persons submitted oral comments on the projects. Comments were generally supportive of the project. Speakers addressed the local benefits that would result from the project: improved municipal and domestic water supply and water quality, flood control, improved irrigation water management, municipal and industrial growth, enhancement of fisheries habitat, and new flat water recreation opportunities.

No comments addressed the adequacy of the DEIS.

January 21, 1992, Public Hearing, Roseburg, Oregon. A total of 22 people attended this meeting. After the Bureau of Reclamation explained to the attendees that the purpose of the meeting was to accept comments on the adequacy of the DEIS, 5 persons submitted oral comments on the project. Most speakers indicated there is a need for the project to improve fisheries habitat, to improve water quality, to satisfy existing water rights, to control flooding, and to provide for controlled seasonal distribution of surface water.

No comments were made concerning the adequacy of the DEIS.

Written Comments

A total of 17 letters were received, commenting on the DEIS. Comments were recieved from:

Creek were about 7 degrees Fahrenheit too high.

Wildlife

Analysis of the HEP field work was completed. A review of the HEP results indicated that the group wanted to move away from the sub-impoundment concept and that mitigating big game habitat on-site did not appear feasible. Mitigation through downstream riparian habitat improvement was discussed.

In the fall of 1989, BR suggested that the agencies needed to consider wildlife impacts likely from other project actions such as constructing the pipeline and irrigating land. These actions were not considered to have large impacts as the pipeline would be placed along existing road rights-of-way and the land base for irrigation is already harvested on a dry land basis.

Discussions continued between the ODFW state and regional offices on the desirability of off-site mitigation. Late in the year, Douglas county suggested the potential of securing Columbian white-tailed deer habitat in other parts of the county as mitigation for big game at the reservoir site. Due to the recovery plan, the white-tailed deer population continues to increase in other areas in Douglas County and has grown to such an extent that significant depredation problems are occurring. ODFW cannot manage the species due to its listing. Secured habitat is needed in order to de-list and manage the species.

Wetlands

BR and Douglas County met with staff from the Roseburg Office of the Soil Conservation Service (SCS). The SCS agreed that some project lands could potentially be classified as jurisdictional wetlands. SCS agreed to perform mapping of hydric soils in the potential irrigated area. BR made a formal request to the state SCS office requesting assistance in mapping the wetlands. Jurisdictional wetland classification involves a determination of hydric soils, present of potential growth of hydrophytic vegetation, and hydrology criteria. The SCS could not promise assistance beyond mapping hydric soils. The ODFW and FWS were included in discussions with the SCS on wetland mapping.

Realizing that formal mapping of jurisdictional wetlands in Douglas County was not scheduled until 1991 or possibly 1992, BR provided a botanist and biologist to check the hydric soil areas for possible inclusion as jurisdictional wetlands. BR

and the FWS also agreed that the hydric soils areas should also receive a HEP in order to determine wildlife impacts.

Cultural Resources

BR awarded a contract to Heritage Research Associates, Inc. for a Class III Survey.

1990

Public Involvement

Douglas County invited State of Oregon environmental groups for a tour of and briefing on the potential project on February 26. The County mailed 36 invitations, but no one showed.

Other public involvement included a Douglas County presentation on the project to the annual meeting of the Douglas County Farmer's Cooperative on March 29. Between 125 and 150 county residents attended the meeting. In July, Douglas County contacted all residents living within the potential pipeline service area to provide a last chance to express their interest in receiving project water. This data was needed to confirm designs.

Environmental Coordination

Douglas County contacted BLM regarding road easements. The County wanted the easements to construct roads that it wanted to use as it continued investigations at the proposed dam site. BLM informed the County and BR that it considered the County proposed actions as project related, and it would not grant the easements until the EIS was finished and a decision document was issued by BR. BLM subsequently requested cooperating agency status on the Milltown Hill EIS. BR responded to BLM's request by describing the status report process that the County and BR were following.

BR had the FWS provide a draft and, later, a final copy of the Coordination Act Report (CAR) to BLM. The County continued coordination with BLM on access and developed an erosion control plan for the access area.

BR and County provided descriptive information needed by the FWS to prepare the CAR. The FWS provided BR with a draft CAR on May 22. An agency meeting was held in Portland, Oregon on

June 26 to discuss the CAR. Discussions at this meeting included the adequacy of the draft CAR with particular emphasis placed on detailing reservoir operations and instream flows, instream water temperatures, fishery monitoring plans, and wildlife mitigation. BR subsequently provided the FWS with maps of wetland and irrigated areas, land classification standard, and a project location map. BR received the final CAR on August 23.

BR produced a draft Status and Environmental Report of the project December 1. On December 12, Douglas County issued a Notice of Intent, to BR, to apply for federal financing of the Milltown Hill project under the Small BR Projects Act of 1956, as amended. Copies of the Notice of Intent were sent to FWS, EPA, Governor of Oregon, Oregon A-95 Clearinghouse (See: Appendix D), Water Resources Department, Department of Environment Quality, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Department of Forestry, Division of State Lands, Department of Parks and Recreation, Department of Transportation.

Threatened and Endangered Species

BR and the agencies agreed that the listing and biological assessment are out of date. BR will update these at the next stage of the study.

Fisheries

The agencies met to discuss the draft FWS Coordination Act Report (CAR) which included the fishery analysis. The group decided that additional temperature modeling was needed, as was a monitoring plan. The group agreed upon a summer data gathering and analysis program for the temperature modelling. The group also outlined an acceptable monitoring program.

Instream Flows

The FWS prepared its draft CAR which included instream flow data. ODFW and NMFS questioned that the project could deliver the stated instream flows. Douglas County provided revised operation studies that demonstrated the project's ability to provide the stated instream flows.

Stream Temperatures

BR and the County met with the FWS early in the winter. The County had contracted with an engineer to perform additional modelling. The new modelling was unable to resolve

calibration problems in the lower river. Several reasons for the discrepancy were considered including marine air effects, river shading, and the predominance of large pools in the lower river.

Wildlife

The Columbian white-tailed deer recovery team met in January to consider the county's proposal to secure white-tailed deer habitat. Team members included representatives from ODFW, FWS, and the Washington Department of Wildlife. Secured habitat totalling 3,500 acres is required for de-listing and 671 acres of this could be credited to the Milltown Hill reservoir. Securing white-tailed deer habitat would also secure habitat for black-tailed deer and other species associated with riparian and oak woodlands.

A modified HEP was performed on lands that would be irrigated. The primary concern in this HEP involved seasonal wetlands.

Based on the HEP results and securing white-tailed deer habitat, ODFW, FWS, the County, and BR were able to prepare a detailed mitigation plan. The plan included mitigation for all potential project impacts to wildlife. All plan mitigation would be on-site with the exception of securing white-tailed deer habitat.

Wetlands

The HEP analysis evaluated adverse impacts on approximately 28 acres of wetlands. The County, BR, ODFW, and FWS determined that wetlands could be mitigated on-site. Mitigation would consist of improvements to an abandoned off-site log pond and development of wetlands in the upper end of the reservoir.

The mitigation plan does not mitigate for jurisdictional wetlands that may be identified at a future date. The project will include a sinking fund to pay for drainage of some irrigated lands, but any lands subsequently identified as jurisdictional wetlands will not receive project drainage. The wildlife evaluation did not consider any wetland drainage effects since drainage is for agricultural lands and not wetlands. No project drainage or change in agricultural practices would occur to negatively affect jurisdictional wetlands at the time the water service contract is negotiated. This would be enforced by County with a wetland protective clause in the water service contract between the County and individual water user.

Cultural Resources

Based on preliminary survey results, BR requested site numbers for 3 locations in the potential reservoir area from the State Historic Preservation Office in February. BR received Heritage Research Associates' draft final report on the Class III Survey.

Recreation

The Douglas County Parks Department gave the Douglas County Water Resources Survey a report presenting recreation concepts for the Milltown Hill dam and reservoir. The report included recreation uses, designated recreation areas, and possible development at each recreation site.

Prime and Unique Farmland

The Soil Conservation Service provided the Bureau of Reclamation information that there are no prime and unique farmlands in the project service area. The soils upstream of the damsite had not been classified, so information on the presence of prime and unique farmlands for this area would not be available until 1991.

1991

Consultation and Coordination

On January 22, the Oregon State Clearinghouse sent Douglas County copies of State agencies' comments on the County's December 12, 1990 Notice of Intent. Comments were received from the following agencies: Department of Forestry, State Historic Preservation Office, Division of lands, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Water Resources Department. Comments from the above agencies will be addressed in the Environmental Report.

On January 28, a meeting was held in Roseburg, attended by Douglas County, BLM, and BR. The County advised BLM of its December 12, 1990 Notice of Intent to apply for federal financing of the project and gave an update on project design.

Threatened and Endangered Species

On February 28, BR requested a list of threatened and endangered (T&E) plant and animal species from FWS, and designated Campbell-Craven responsible for writing the Section

7 biological assessment.

On April 19, FWS furnished Campbell-Craven a list of T&E plant and animal species that may be present in the project area.

On April 28, Campbell-Craven initiated a survey of Northern spotted owls in the project area and vicinity.

On May 1, 1991, FWS published in the Federal Register a proposed determination of critical habitat of the Northern spotted owl. All lands in Township 23S., R.4W., Willamette Meridian, including all proposed "take lands" for the reservoir have been listed as critical habitat in the publication. Comments will be received until June 5, 1991. A revised initial habitat proposal will be published 60 days later. Public comments on the revised proposal will be received for 60 days.

On August 22, Campbell-Craven reported on the survey of the Northern spotted owl. No owls were sighted or heard within 1.2 miles of the proposed dam site.

On August 11, Campbell-Craven completed a Biological Assessment of the project, according to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973. The Biological Assessment was sent to the Bureau of Reclamation for review.

On August 13, the Fish and Wildlife Service published in the Federal Register (Vol 56, No 156), a revised proposed rule of Critical Habitat for the Northern spotted owl. No federal, state, county or private lands within the project "take line" have been designated as critical habitat (Page 40070). There is a 60-day public comment period. The Fish and Wildlife Service will publish a final critical habitat rule within 60 days after close of the public comment period.

On December 12, the Fish and Wildlife Service responded to the Bureau of Reclamation's November 1, 1991 Biological Assessment of Potential Effects of the Project on Listed and Candidate Pland and Annual Species. The FWS concurred with the Bureau's assessment that the project would not adversely affect the Columbian white-tailed deer, Bald eagles, peregrine falcon or Northern spotted owl.

The FWS could not properly address the Umpqua chub, northwestern pond turtle or rough allocarya (unlisted candidate species) due to inadequate population information. Additional surveys are needed.

Prime and Unique Farmlands

The Soil Conservation Service, in compliance with the Farmland Protection Act, Public Law 97-98, conducted a soil survey upstream of the damsite. Subsequently, the Soil Conservation Service provided a list of soils. Based on the soil map, 115 acres of prime farmlands were identified, no unique farmlands were identified.

1992

Public Involvement

Public Hearings

January 20, 1992 Public Hearing, Drain, Oregon. A total of 30 people attended this meeting. After the Bureau of Reclamation explained that the purpose of the meeting was to accept oral or written comments on the adequacy of the DEIS, 6 persons submitted oral comments on the projects. Comments were generally supportive of the project. Speakers addressed the local benefits that would result from the project: improved municipal and domestic water supply and water quality, flood control, improved irrigation water management, municipal and industrial growth, enhancement of fisheries habitat, and new flat water recreation opportunities.

No comments addressed the adequacy of the DEIS.

January 21, 1992, Public Hearing, Roseburg, Oregon. A total of 22 people attended this meeting. After the Bureau of Reclamation explained to the attendees that the purpose of the meeting was to accept comments on the adequacy of the DEIS, 5 persons submitted oral comments on the project. Most speakers indicated there is a need for the project to improve fisheries habitat, to improve water quality, to satisfy existing water rights, to control flooding, and to provide for controlled seasonal distribution of surface water.

No comments were made concerning the adequacy of the DEIS.

Written Comments

A total of 17 letters were received, commenting on the DEIS. Comments were received from:

Albert D. Applegate Jr., Mayor, City of Yoncalla
Peter Graff, C.C.D. Business Development Corporation
George Winterbotham
Dale Besset
Randy Crockett
Martha O. Pagel, Senior Policy Advisor for Natural
Resources
Rick Bastasch, Oregon Water Resources Department
Chuck Craig, Oregon Department of Agriculture
William L. Parks, Oregon Division of State Lands
Ray Cranston, Oregon Department of Transportation
David Stere, Oregon Department of Forestry
Stephanie Burchfield, Department of Fish and
Wildlife
Merritt E. Tuttle, National Marine Fisheries Service
W.B. Paynter, Department of the Army Corps of
Engineers
Richard L. Winters, National Park Service
Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Ronald A. Lee, Environmental Protection Agency

The letters and Bureau of Reclamation comments are listed in Appendix G.

Consultation and Coordination

As a result of cultural resource surveys made in the project area in 1990 and 1991, 3 archeological sites were discovered and numerous undiscovered sites were considered present. During January and February 1992, consultations were started with SHPO to define a study plan for exploratory testing to find undiscovered sites. After exploratory testing, formal testing will occur to define areas where data recovery would occur. Formal testing is scheduled for 1992. In April 1992, SHPO was consulted about the eligibility and appropriate mitigation of a prehistoric site that will be affected by construction scheduled for fall 1992. In May, the SHPO concurred that the site is eligible to the Register, and site a mitigation agreement. Consultations were then immediately started in the Advisory Council about the mitigation plan for that site.

Douglas County applied to the Eugene District office, BLM for a Special Use Permit, to use rock from the Hobart Quarry. BLM would develop an environmental assessment of the County's proposal.

Fisheries

After consultation with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, increases in numbers of fish that could be expected as a result of project enhancement were revised.

Threatened and Endangered Species

In January 1992, the Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) published a Final Ruling in the Federal Register regarding critical habitat for the Northern spotted owl habitat.

Consultation with FWS (pers. comm., Allison Banks, FWS, March 20, 1992 and May 6, 1992) confirmed that the nearest critical habitat was in unit OR-23. This unit is not within the project take area.

Project Pre-construction, Construction, and Operation Schedule Changes

As a result of comments received from federal and state agencies, a revised schedule was devised to reflect pre-construction activities, construction activities, and operation activities. These activities would involve the development of plans for mitigating adverse project impacts during construction and operation. Plans for enhancement of biological conditions would also be developed. A series of monitoring programs would be devised to assess project effects on various resources, such as wildlife, fisheries, water temperatures, water quality and quantity, wetlands, and candidate threatened and endangered species.