

DRAFT PROJECT PROSPECTUS

Part 3 Project Environmental Classification

Project Classification	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Class 1 DEIS FEIS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Class 2 Categorical Exclusion
<input type="checkbox"/>	Programmatic Categ. Exclusion
<input type="checkbox"/>	Class 3 EA Revised EA

Project Name: S7: OR 229 Kosydar SPIS Segment	Bridge No. Not Applicable	County: Lincoln	Reg: 2	Area: 4	Key Number:	Jurisdiction:
					District:	

1) Provide a brief description of the Project **Realign OR 229 to eliminate curves or widen roadway 14 feet to meet current lane width and shoulder width standards**

2) Estimated Right-of-Way Impacts (Including Easements, Number of Parcels, Acreage, and Improvements) **Private property for right-of-way is anticipated, but the extent of right-of-way impacts will depend on final alignment/project footprint.**

3) Estimated Traffic Volume, Flow Pattern and Safety Impacts (Including Construction Impacts, Detours, etc.) **810 ADT (2004); insignificant traffic flow pattern, safety, and construction impacts anticipated**

4) Estimated Land Use and Socioeconomic Impact (Including Consistency with Comprehensive Plan) **None; consistent with Comprehensive Plan (pending, 2007)**

5) Estimated Wetlands, Waterways and Water Quality Impacts **This segment of OR 229 is adjacent to the Siletz River. The Siletz River is a perennial stream that drains to the Pacific Ocean approximately 16 miles downstream. The NWI map identifies the Siletz River at this location as estuarine riverine upper perennial open water permanent (R3OWH). The NWI map also identifies palustrine forested broad-leaved deciduous intermittently flooded (PFO1J) wetlands along the banks of the Siletz River. At this location, the river and associated wetlands are at the base of an approximately 50-foot embankment adjacent to the road. No other wetland areas were immediately adjacent to the road. A review of the Soil Survey of Lincoln County, Oregon (NRCS, 1994) reveals one soil type mapped within the study area: Siletz silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes. Siletz silt loam is not listed as hydric and does not contain inclusions of hydric soils. The Siletz River is a Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) 303D water quality limited stream. State and Federal 404 Permit for impact to wetlands is expected due to the proximity of the Siletz River.**

6) Estimated Biological & Threatened & Endangered Species Impacts
USGS Quad Name, Township, Range, Section
Toledo North, Oregon Quadrangle (1984). T9S R10W S21
The Oregon Natural Heritage Information Center (ORNHIC) identifies one plant species and four aquatic species as occurring within 2 miles of the project area: queen of the forest (*Filipendula occidentalis*), State Candidate; winter steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*, pop 31), summer steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*, pop 30), Oregon Coast ESU, chum salmon (*Oncorhynchus keta*, pop 4), Pacific Coast ESU, and coho salmon, Oregon Coast ESU (*Oncorhynchus kisutch* pop 3). USFWS identifies no listed or candidate plant species potentially occurring in Lincoln County. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife StreamNet identifies the Siletz River at this location as rearing and migration habitat for coho Salmon, summer steelhead, and spawning and rearing habitat for winter steelhead. Consultation with NMFS is expected due to the proximity of the Siletz River.

7) Estimated Archaeology and Historical Impacts **Oregon SHPO Review, consultation with Lincoln County Historical Society, and Field Reconnaissance identified no apparent impacts. No archaeological field surveys have been conducted.**

8) Estimated Park, Visual Impacts and 4(f) Potential **None**

9) Estimated Air, Noise and Energy Impacts **No noise analysis is anticipated because there are no noise receptors. The project is compatible with the Statewide Air Quality Report.**

10) Estimated Hazardous Materials Impacts **None**

11) Preliminary Identification of Potential Areas of Critical Concern and Controversial Issues **Based on the environmental review, no areas of critical concern or potentially controversial issues have been identified.**

12) Documentation Requirements **Potential Documentation (depending on final project footprint): Wetland Delineation; Ordinary High Water Delineation; State and Federal 404 Permit for impacts to wetlands or waters. Consultation with National Marine Fisheries Service may be required. An archaeological survey report documenting the findings of an archaeological investigation will be required.**

Prepared By: Larry Weymouth, CH2M HILL	FHWA or State Official Approval:		
Date: August 2007	Revised: <input type="checkbox"/>	Phone Number: 541.768.3321	Date:
		Phone Number:	

**REGION ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
ATTACHMENT TO PART 3 (PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL CLASSIFICATION)**

Project: S7: OR 229 Kosydar SPIS Segment (Milepost 19.91 – 20.09)

Key No:

Instructions:

This checklist should be completed and attached to the Part 3. It will provide information to assist in appropriately classifying projects. A “Yes” answer indicates areas of concern, a “No” answer indicates no concerns, and UNK indicates that you didn’t check into that area. The primary intent of the checklist is to ensure these items have been considered, and where appropriate, researched. When something of potential impact is found, explain in the appropriate section of the Part 3. If you have any questions, please call (503) 986-3477. The receptionist will transfer you to the appropriate resource person for assistance.

1. Prepared By: Larry Weymouth, CH2M HILL
2. Phone Number: 541.768.3321
3. Date: August 2007
4. Applicable Bridge Number: Not Applicable
5. A brief description of the project: Realign OR 229 to eliminate curves or widen roadway 14 feet to meet current lane width and shoulder width standards

Air Quality

- | | | | |
|-----|----|-----|---|
| Yes | No | Unk | 6 Is project in an air quality non-attainment area? NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 7 CO NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 8 Ozone NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 9 PM10 NO |
| | | | Is project missing from: |
| Yes | No | Unk | 10 STIP YES |
| Yes | No | Unk | 11 RTP Not Applicable |
| Yes | No | Unk | 12 MTIP Not Applicable |
| | | | 13 Comment (Questions 10,11,12): There is no US Census Urbanized Area or MPO within Lincoln County |
| Yes | No | Unk | 14 Does the project involve adding lanes, signalization, channelization, and/or alignment changes? Unknown |
| | | | 15 Comment (Question 14): Alignment change possible to reduce or eliminate curve |

Archaeology

- | | | | |
|-----|----|-----|--|
| Yes | No | Unk | 18 Are archaeologically sensitive areas potentially affected (confluence of rivers, headlands, coves, overlooks, etc.)? YES |
| | | | 19 Comment (Question 18): Adjacent to Siletz River |
| Yes | No | Unk | 20 Does local city/county Comprehensive Plan indicate potential Goal 5 resources? NO |
| | | | 21 Comment (Question 20): |
| Yes | No | Unk | 22 Does contact with local BLM or USFS archaeologist indicate any problems? NO |
| | | | 23 Comment (Question 22): |
| Yes | No | Unk | 24 Extent and cause of previous ground disturbance (minor, major), not counting farmed land? Road construction |
| Yes | No | Unk | 25 Does project entail new ground disturbances? YES |
| | | | 26 Comment (Question 25): |
| | | | The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has known archeological sites cataloged. NO sites cataloged or listed |
| Yes | No | Unk | 27 Consulted with the SHPO archeologist? Oregon SHPO files reviewed |
| | | | 28 Comment (Question 27): |

Biology

- | | | | |
|-----|----|-----|--|
| | | | USGS Quad Name, Township, Range, Section (Questions 31-34): |
| | | | 31 : Toledo North, Oregon (1984) |
| | | | 32 : TS9W |
| | | | 33 : R10W |
| | | | 34 : S21 |
| Yes | No | Unk | 35 Does contact with local ODFW (District Fish/Game/Habitat/Non-game) biologists indicate any problems? YES |
| | | | 36 Name of ODFW biologist and comments: See Attachment S7 |
| Yes | No | Unk | 37 Is there any local knowledge of T&E or sensitive (candidate) species in area? Unknown |
| | | | 38 Comment (Question 37): |
| Yes | No | Unk | 39 Are any aquatic T&E species present? Unknown |
| | | | 40 Comment (Question 39): |
| Yes | No | Unk | 41 Does contact with local BLM or USFS biologists indicate any problems? YES |
| | | | 42 Name of BLM or USFS biologist and comments: See Attachment S7 |
| | | | 43 What are the results from a Natural Heritage Database check? See Attachment S7 |
| Yes | No | Unk | 44 Is stream on ODFW Rivers Information System database? YES |
| | | | 45 Comment (Question 44): See Attachment S7 |
| | | | 46 Confirmed ODFW preferred in-water work period(s) for project area? (List if applicable): July 1 to August 31 |

**REGION ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
ATTACHMENT TO PART 3 (PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL CLASSIFICATION)**

Project: S7: OR 229 Kosydar SPIS Segment (Milepost 19.91 – 20.09)

Key No:

Instructions:

This checklist should be completed and attached to the Part 3. It will provide information to assist in appropriately classifying projects. A “Yes” answer indicates areas of concern, a “No” answer indicates no concerns, and UNK indicates that you didn’t check into that area. The primary intent of the checklist is to ensure these items have been considered, and where appropriate, researched. When something of potential impact is found, explain in the appropriate section of the Part 3. If you have any questions, please call (503) 986-3477. The receptionist will transfer you to the appropriate resource person for assistance.

1. Prepared By: _____
2. Phone Number: _____
3. Date: _____
4. Applicable Bridge Number: _____
5. A brief description of the project: _____

47 List any streams impacted by project: **Potential indirect impact to the Siletz River**

Yes No Unk 48 Is the creek or river classified as Essential Salmonid Habitat by the Oregon Division of State Lands? **YES**

Energy:

Yes No Unk 51 Does project affect energy use due to traffic patterns or volumes, or involve speed zone changes? **NO**
52 Comment (Question 51):

Geology:

Yes No Unk 55 Discussions with Region Geologist indicate any major concerns? **NO**
56 Comment (Question 55):

Yes No Unk 57 Drilling / exploration anticipated? **NO**
58 Comment (Question 57):

Hazardous Materials:

Yes No Unk 59 Does contact with local DEQ office indicate any concerns? **NO**
60 Comment (Question 59):

Yes No Unk 61 Does contact with State Fire Marshal’s office indicate any concerns? **NO**
62 Comment (Question 61):

Yes No Unk 63 Does contact with local fire department indicate any concerns? **NO**
64 Comment (Question 63):

Yes No Unk 65 Does contact with PUC indicate any highway spills/incidents? **NO**
66 Comment (Question 65):

Yes No Unk 67 R/W acquisition impacts gas stations / repair shops / industrial sites / landfills, etc.? **NO**
68 Comment (Question 67):

Yes No Unk 69 Ground disturbances anticipated (excavation / drilling, etc.) near known or potential hazmat sites? **NO**
70 Comment (Question 69):

Results of check of DEQ lists for each of the following:

Yes No Unk 71 UST **NO**

Yes No Unk 72 Release Incident **NO**

Yes No Unk 73 RCRA **NO**

Yes No Unk 74 Solid Waste **NO**

Yes No Unk 75 TSD **NO**

Yes No Unk 76 Leaking UST **NO**

Yes No Unk 77 Confirmed release **NO**

Yes No Unk 78 Other **NO**

79 List any occurrence on the above items:

Historical:

Yes No Unk 82 Does any city/county comp plan list any buildings/items in the project area as Goal 5 resources? **NO**
83 Comment (Question 82):

Yes No Unk 84 Any impacted sites nominated/listed as eligible for National Register? **NO**
85 Comment (Question 84):

Yes No Unk 86 Does contact with city/county Historical Society indicate potential resources? **NO**
87 Comment (Question 86):

Yes No Unk 88 Any buildings in the project area thought to be 50 years or older? **NO**

**REGION ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
ATTACHMENT TO PART 3 (PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL CLASSIFICATION)**

Project: S7: OR 229 Kosydar SPIS Segment (Milepost 19.91 – 20.09)

Key No:

Instructions:

This checklist should be completed and attached to the Part 3. It will provide information to assist in appropriately classifying projects. A “Yes” answer indicates areas of concern, a “No” answer indicates no concerns, and UNK indicates that you didn’t check into that area. The primary intent of the checklist is to ensure these items have been considered, and where appropriate, researched. When something of potential impact is found, explain in the appropriate section of the Part 3. If you have any questions, please call (503) 986-3477. The receptionist will transfer you to the appropriate resource person for assistance.

1. Prepared By: _____
2. Phone Number: _____
3. Date: _____
4. Applicable Bridge Number: _____
5. A brief description of the project: _____

- 89 Comment (Question 88):
- Yes No Unk 90 Any apparent / unique / suspect structures of possible historical interest? **NO**
- 91 Comment (Question 90):
- Yes No Unk 92 Historic district / trails / bridges? **NO**
- 93 Comment (Question 92):
- Yes No Unk 94 Was the SHPO historic database consulted? **YES**
- 95 Comment (Question 94):

Land Use / Planning:

- Yes No Unk 98 Project identified in local transportation improvement plan? **YES**
- 99 Comment (Question 98): **Pending, 2007**
- Yes No Unk 100 Does contact with local jurisdiction planning department indicate any concerns? **NO**
- 101 Comment (Question 100):
- Yes No Unk 102 Is project outside of UGB? **YES**
- 103 Comment (Question 102):
- Yes No Unk 104 Does project cross or touch UGB? **NO**
- 105 Comment (Question 104):
- Yes No Unk 106 Does Coastal Zone Management Act apply? **YES**
- 107 Comment (Question 106):
- Yes No Unk 108 Is there Forest or EFU zoning on or impacted by the project? **NO**
- 109 Comment (Question 108):
- Yes No Unk 110 Are there other protected resources (i.e. estuary, wetlands, greenways, etc.)? **NO**
- 111 If Yes, list:
- Yes No Unk 112 Does contact with local NRCS indicate “High Value” farmland concerns? **NO**
- 113 Comment (Question 112):
- Yes No Unk 114 Farmland Conversion Impact Rating applicable? **NO**
- 115 Comment (Question 114):
- 116 List Comprehensive Plan designations being impacted: **A-C (Agricultural Conservation)**
- 117 List zoning designations being impacted: **A-C (Agricultural Conservation)**

Region Planner’s opinion that the project conforms with (If not, explain):

- Yes No Unk 118 Transportation Planning Rule **YES**
- 119 Comment (Question 118):
- Yes No Unk 120 Statewide Planning Goals **YES**
- 121 Comment (Question 120):
- Yes No Unk 122 Comprehensive Plan (county / city or both) **YES**
- 123 Comment (Question 122):

Noise:

- Yes No Unk 126 Any shift in horizontal or vertical alignment? If so, amount of shift: **Unknown**
- 127 Horizontal: **Potential for alignment to shift to reduce or eliminate curve**
- 128 Vertical:
- Yes No Unk 129 Does project increase the number of through travel lanes? (See Project Components screen)
- 130 Number of existing lanes: **2**
- 131 Number of proposed lanes: **2**
- Yes No Unk 132 Is this a new roadway located on a new alignment? **NO**

**REGION ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
ATTACHMENT TO PART 3 (PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL CLASSIFICATION)**

Project: S7: OR 229 Kosydar SPIS Segment (Milepost 19.91 – 20.09)

Key No:

Instructions:

This checklist should be completed and attached to the Part 3. It will provide information to assist in appropriately classifying projects. A “Yes” answer indicates areas of concern, a “No” answer indicates no concerns, and UNK indicates that you didn’t check into that area. The primary intent of the checklist is to ensure these items have been considered, and where appropriate, researched. When something of potential impact is found, explain in the appropriate section of the Part 3. If you have any questions, please call (503) 986-3477. The receptionist will transfer you to the appropriate resource person for assistance.

1. Prepared By: _____
2. Phone Number: _____
3. Date: _____
4. Applicable Bridge Number: _____
5. A brief description of the project: _____

133 Comment (Question 132):
 Yes No Unk 134 Any known noise problems / complaints? **NO**
 135 Comment (Question 134):
 Yes No Unk 136 Will this project result in the removal of topographical features which currently shield receptors? **NO**
 137 Comment (Question 136):

Approximate number of buildings / activity areas within 61 meters (200 feet) of proposed right of way line:
 138 Commercial: **0**
 139 Industrial: **0**
 140 Public: **0**
 141 Residences: **0**
 142 Schools: **0**
 143 Churches: **0**
 144 Parks: **0**

Section 4(f) Potential:

Yes No Unk 147 Parks, wildlife refuges, historic buildings, recreational areas, etc., impacted? **NO**
 148 If yes, explain:

Section 6(f) Potential:

Yes No Unk 151 Land & Water Conservation Funds used to acquire parks, or make improvements, etc.? **NO**
 152 If yes, explain:

Socioeconomics:

Yes No Unk 153 Do building displacements appear key to economy / neighborhood? **NO**
 154 Comment (Question 153):
 155 Number of building displacements? **0**

General use of adjacent land:

Yes No Unk 156 Residential **NO**
 Yes No Unk 157 Commercial **NO**
 Yes No Unk 158 Farm/Range **NO**
 Yes No Unk 159 Public **NO**
 Yes No Unk 160 Other **Vegetated undeveloped land**
 161 If other, explain:
 162 Estimate of number of people living adjacent to project: **0**
 163 Estimate of number of people working adjacent to project: **0**
 Yes No Unk 164 Divide or disrupt an established community, or affect neighborhood character or stability? **NO**
 165 Comment (Question 164):
 Yes No Unk 166 Affect minority, elderly, handicapped, low income, transit-dependent, or other specific interest group? **NO**
 167 Comment (Question 166):

Visual:

Yes No Unk 170 Designated State or Federal Scenic Highway? **NO**
 171 Comment (Question 170):
 Yes No Unk 172 Oregon Forest Practices Act restrictions apply? **NO**
 173 Comment (Question 172):

**REGION ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
ATTACHMENT TO PART 3 (PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL CLASSIFICATION)**

Project: S7: OR 229 Kosydar SPIS Segment (Milepost 19.91 – 20.09)

Key No:

Instructions:

This checklist should be completed and attached to the Part 3. It will provide information to assist in appropriately classifying projects. A "Yes" answer indicates areas of concern, a "No" answer indicates no concerns, and UNK indicates that you didn't check into that area. The primary intent of the checklist is to ensure these items have been considered, and where appropriate, researched. When something of potential impact is found, explain in the appropriate section of the Part 3. If you have any questions, please call (503) 986-3477. The receptionist will transfer you to the appropriate resource person for assistance.

1. Prepared By: _____
2. Phone Number: _____
3. Date: _____
4. Applicable Bridge Number: _____
5. A brief description of the project: _____

- | | | | |
|-----|----|-----|---|
| Yes | No | Unk | 174 Major cut / fills? NO |
| | | | 175 Comment (Question 174): |
| Yes | No | Unk | 176 Bridges or large retaining walls anticipated? NO |
| | | | 177 Comment (Question 176): |
| Yes | No | Unk | 178 Any rivers on the Oregon Scenic Waterway listing? NO |
| | | | 179 Comment (Question 178): |
| Yes | No | Unk | 180 Any rivers on the Federal Wild and Scenic River Listings? NO |
| | | | 181 Comment (Question 180): |

Water Ways / Water Quality:

- | | | | |
|-----|----|-----|---|
| Yes | No | Unk | 184 Does city / county comp plan list any water resources as Goal 5 resources? NO |
| | | | 185 Comment (Question 184): |
| Yes | No | Unk | 186 Within FEMA 100-year flood plain? NO |
| | | | 187 Comment (Question 186): FIRM Flood Insurance Rate Map, Lincoln County, OR. Panel 125 of 475. September 3, 1980 |
| Yes | No | Unk | 188 Within FEMA regulated floodway? NO |
| | | | 189 Comment (Question 188): |
| Yes | No | Unk | 190 Water quality limited stream impacted? NO |
| | | | 191 Comment (Question 190): |
| Yes | No | Unk | 192 Any active wells impacted? Unknown |
| | | | 193 Comment (Question 192): |
| | | | 194 Select range of ADT: 810 (2004) |
| | | | 195 Comment (Question 196): |
| Yes | No | Unk | 196 Navigable waterway(s)? NO |
| | | | 197 Comment (Question 196): See Attachment S7 |
| Yes | No | Unk | 198 New impervious surface area >= 1,000 sq. meters? Unknown |
| | | | 199 Comment (Question 198): |
| Yes | No | Unk | 200 Any irrigation districts impacted? Unknown |
| | | | 201 Comment (Question 200): |
| Yes | No | Unk | 202 Are there T&E aquatic species in the receiving water? YES |
| | | | 203 Comment (Question 202): See Attachment S7 |
| Yes | No | Unk | 204 Existing storm drain system? Unknown |
| | | | 205 Comment (Question 204): |

Wetlands

- | | | | |
|-----|----|-----|---|
| Yes | No | Unk | 208 National wetlands inventory maps show any wetlands in the project area? YES |
| | | | 209 Comment (Question 208): See Attachment S7 |
| Yes | No | Unk | 210 Soil conservation maps indicate hydric soils in project area? NO |
| | | | 211 Comment (Question 210): See Attachment S7 |
| Yes | No | Unk | 212 Local Comprehensive Plan show any wetlands as protected resources? NO |
| | | | 213 Comment (Question 212): |
| Yes | No | Unk | 214 Riparian or wetland vegetation evident from visual inspection? YES |
| | | | 215 Comment (Question 214): Forested riparian vegetation west of OR 229 along the Siletz River |

Permits: (Note: "Unknown" is not a valid response in this section)

- | | | | |
|-----|----|-----|---|
| Yes | No | Unk | 218 US Corps of Engineers Section 404 NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 219 DSL Removal and Fill NO |

**REGION ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
ATTACHMENT TO PART 3 (PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL CLASSIFICATION)**

Project: S7: OR 229 Kosydar SPIS Segment (Milepost 19.91 – 20.09)

Key No:

Instructions:

This checklist should be completed and attached to the Part 3. It will provide information to assist in appropriately classifying projects. A "Yes" answer indicates areas of concern, a "No" answer indicates no concerns, and UNK indicates that you didn't check into that area. The primary intent of the checklist is to ensure these items have been considered, and where appropriate, researched. When something of potential impact is found, explain in the appropriate section of the Part 3. If you have any questions, please call (503) 986-3477. The receptionist will transfer you to the appropriate resource person for assistance.

1. Prepared By: _____ 2. Phone Number: _____ 3. Date: _____ 4. Applicable Bridge Number: _____ 5. A brief description of the project: _____

- | | | | |
|-----|----|-----|--|
| Yes | No | Unk | 220 DEQ Indirect Source (Air) NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 221 PUC (Railroad) NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 222 DOGAMI NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 223 Coast Guard NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 224 Local Jurisdiction National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) NO |
| | | | 225 Other: |

Clearances: (Note: "Unknown" is not a valid response in this section)

- | | | | |
|-----|----|-----|---|
| Yes | No | Unk | 226 State and/or Federal Endangered Species Act YES |
| Yes | No | Unk | 227 State Historic Preservation Office (Historic) NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 228 State Historic Preservation Office (Archaeological) NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 229 FHWA Noise NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 230 Air Conformity NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 231 DEQ Commercial / Industrial Noise Regulation NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 232 Hazmat Materials Clearance NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 233 ODOT Erosion Control Plan YES |

Prepared by:	Phone Number:	Date:
---------------------	----------------------	--------------

ATTACHMENT S-7

36	Name of ODFW biologist and comments:	<p>Bob Buckman/Fish Biologist (5/17/2007): "In addition to ORNHIC and StreamNet identified species, Siletz River is also important habitat for cutthroat trout, spring- and fall-run chinook salmon, Pacific lamprey. Siletz River is a major coastal river that provides important habitat for multi-species, multi-life stages. It is also heavily used for recreational purposes, e.g. boating, fishing. Siletz River is not tidally influenced at this location. It is a couple of miles above tidewater."</p> <p>Doug Cottam/District Wildlife Biologist (5/18/07): "I believe the T & E species you noted (from the ORNHIC) are accurate..."</p>
42	Name of BLM or USFS biologist and comments:	<p>David Leal/USFWS (5/11/2007): "...probably spotted owl and murrelet historic habitat. You will need to evaluate whether the habitat within 300 feet of the projects has potential for nesting use. Murrelet nest trees are typically mature conifers with large diameter branches with moss. These types of trees are not uncommon in the road right-of-way due to absence of timber harvest."</p>
43	What are the results from a Natural Heritage Database check?	<p>ORNHIC identifies one plant species and four aquatic species as occurring within 2 miles of the project area: queen of the forest (<i>Filipendula occidentalis</i>), State Candidate; winter steelhead (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>, pop 31), summer steelhead (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>, pop 30), Oregon Coast ESU, chum salmon (<i>Oncorhynchus keta</i>, pop 4), Pacific Coast ESU, and coho salmon, Oregon Coast ESU (<i>Oncorhynchus kisutch</i> pop 3).</p>
45	Comment (Question 44):	<p>Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife StreamNet identifies the Siletz River at this location as rearing and migration habitat for coho Salmon, summer steelhead, and spawning and rearing habitat for winter steelhead.</p>
203	Comment (Question 202):	<p>ORNHIC identifies four aquatic species as occurring within 2 miles of the project area: winter steelhead (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>, pop 31), summer steelhead (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>, pop 30), Oregon Coast ESU, chum salmon (<i>Oncorhynchus keta</i>, pop 4), Pacific Coast ESU, and coho salmon, Oregon Coast ESU (<i>Oncorhynchus kisutch</i> pop 3).</p>
209	Comment (Question 208):	<p>The NWI map identifies palustrine forested broad-leaved deciduous intermittently flooded (PFO1J) wetlands along the banks of the Siletz River. At this location, the river and associated wetlands are at the base of an approximately 50-foot embankment adjacent to the road. No other wetland areas were immediately adjacent to the road.</p>
211	Comment (Question 210):	<p>A review of the Soil Survey of Lincoln County, Oregon (NRCS, 1994) reveals one soil type mapped within the study area: Siletz silt loam, 0 to 3 percent slopes. Siletz silt loam is not listed as hydric and does not contain inclusions of hydric soils.</p>