## CHECKLIST FOR THE CONTENTS OF A RECORD OF DECISION (ROD)

| Record of Decision Title:   |
|---|
| Final EIS Title (if different from the above ROD title):  |
| Reviewer:   |
| Date of Final EIS: Date of ROD:   |
| DECISION<br>1. Does the ROD state what the decision was? 1505.2(a)<br>yes/no page(s)  |
| <ol> <li>Does the ROD identify all alternatives considered by BPA in reaching its decision? 1505.2(bygs/no page(s))</li> </ol>  |
| 3. Does the ROD specify which alternative or alternatives were considered to be environmental preferable and why? 1505.2(b) yes/no page(s)  |
| <ul> <li>4. Does the ROD (i)identify and (ii) discuss all relevant factors including any essential considerations of national policy which were balanced by the agency in making its decision? 1505.2(b)</li> <li>yes/no page(s)</li> </ul> |
| 5. Does the ROD state how those factors identified and discussed in question 4 entered into BPA=s decision? 1505.2(b) yes/no page(s)  |
| 6. If the chosen alternative was not environmentally preferable alternative, does the ROD state why an environmentally preferable alternative was not chosen? 1505.2(b): 15500.2(f) yes/no page(s)  |
| MITIGATION  |
| 7. Does the ROD state whether all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from the alternative selected have been adopted? 1505.2(c)  |
| yes/no page(s)  |
| 8. Does the ROD identify all practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm for th   |

alternative selected which were identified in the EIS but which were not adopted? 1505.2 (c) yes/no page(s)\_\_\_\_

9. Does the ROD state the reasons why the mitigation measures identified in question 8 were not adopted? 1505.2(c)

yes/no page(s)\_\_\_\_

## MONITORING AND ENFORCEMENT

10. Does the ROD state whether a monitoring and enforcement program is applicable for any mitigation? 1505.2(c)

yes/no page(s)\_\_\_\_

11. Does the ROD state whether any applicable monitoring and enforcement program has been adopted? 1505.2(c)

yes/no page(s)\_\_\_\_

12. Does the ROD summarize monitoring and enforcement programs which have been adopted? 1505.2(c)

yes/no pages(s)\_\_\_\_

## MISCELLANEOUS

13. Is the ROD concise? 1505.2

yes/no page(s)\_\_\_\_

14. Does the ROD state on its face how it will be made publically available? 1505.2 yes/no page(s)\_\_\_\_

15. Does the ROD state on its face that no decision has been made until the later of the following dates: (1) ninety (90) days after publication of the notice for a draft EIS: (2) thirty (30) days after publication of the notice for a final EIS? 1506.10(b)

yes/no page(s)\_\_\_\_

16. (a) Endangered and threatened species and critical habitat. If any of the alternatives have been the subject of an FWS biological opinion (which means it has been determined that one or more alternatives may or will affect an endangered or threatened species or critical habitat either adversely or beneficially), does the ROD state that the FWS will be notified of the final determination on whether to proceed with the proposed activity or program? (Proposed) 50 CFR 402.16(a)

yes/no page(s)\_\_\_\_

(b)Heritage Conservation. If the decision is or includes taking an action which would adversely affect a property on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, does the ROD state (1) that a memorandum of agreement has been prepared between (i) the Federal

agency, (ii) the State Historic Preservation Officer and (iii) the Executive Director of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and (2) that the terms of the memorandum of agreement will be carried out? 36 CFR 800.6(c)(3)

yes/no page(s)\_\_\_\_

(c) <u>A-95.</u> If any of the alternatives include taking an action which is direct Federal development and/or Federal assistance, does the ROD (1) state how clearinghouse will be notified of actions taken (implementing, timing, postponement, abandonment, etc.), and (2) explain any actions taken contrary to Clearinghouse recommendations? OMB Circular A-95. Part II. Section 5(b)(4)

yes/no page(s)\_\_\_\_

(d) <u>Coastal zones</u>. If the decision is or includes taking an action which (1) is a development project in the coastal zone, (2) directly affects the coastal zone, (3) is listed in an approved coastal management program as requiring a consistency determination, (5) is the same as or similar to actions for which a consistency determination has been prepared in the past, or (6) has been subject to a thorough consistency assessment, does the ROD state that State coastal management agencies have been provided with consistency information at least 90 days prior to the date of the decision, or that both the Federal agency and the State agency have agreed to an alternative period. 15 CFR 930.34(b) and 930.41(c)

yes/no page(s)\_\_\_\_

(e) <u>Flood plains</u>. If the decision is or includes taking an action in a flood plain, does the ROD include (1) an explanation of why **A**the only practicable alternative consistent with the law and with the policies set forth in (the flood plains Executive Order) requires siting in a flood plain@, and (2) a statement that the action is designed or modified  $\pm$ 0 minimize potential harm to or within the flood plain@(consistent with agencies implementing procedures)? Executive Order 11988, Flood plain Management, Section 2(a)(2)(42 FR 26951, May 25, 1977) yes/no page(s)\_\_\_\_

(f) <u>Wetlands.</u> If the decision is or includes undertaking or providing assistance for new construction located in wetlands, does the ROD include a finding A(1) that there is no practicable alternative to such construction, and (2) that the proposed action includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands which may result from such use@(taking into account economic, environmental and other pertinent factors)? Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands, Section 3(a) (42 FR 26961, May 25, 1977)

yes/no page(s)\_\_\_\_

(g) <u>Farmlands.</u> If the decision is or includes taking an action which converts prime or unique farmlands to other uses, does the ROD include a finding that there was no practicable alternative to such conversion (taking into account economic, environmental and other pertinent factors such as the agency mission)? NEPA Section 101(b)(4): August 11, 1980 (45 FR 59189, September 8, 1980)

yes/no page(s)\_\_\_\_

Back to Table of Contents