

First publication of the notice of this timber sale will be October 25, 2012 in the Eugene Register-Guard. This notice in the newspaper constitutes the decision document for purposes of protest under 43 CFR 5003 - Administrative Remedies. Protests of this sale must be filed within 15 days after the first publication of this notice. As interpreted by BLM, the regulations do not authorize the acceptance of protests in any form other than a signed, written hard copy that is delivered to the physical address of the Eugene District Office as defined below.

Site Address (Note: DO NOT send mail to this address):  
3106 Pierce Parkway, Suite E  
Springfield Oregon

Mailing address:  
Bureau of Land Management  
P.O. Box 10226  
Eugene, Oregon 97440

If you have any questions, please call Sharmila Premdas at (541) 683-6794.

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

U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)  
Eugene District, Oregon

### Farman Flats Density Management Project DOI-BLM-OR-E050-2010-0007-DNA

---

**A. Description of the Proposed Action:** The proposed action is to implement the Farman Flats Density Management Project by thinning approximately 204 acres within the Upper Siuslaw Landscape Plan EA planning area. The proposed action (including silvicultural prescriptions, logging systems, Riparian Reserve treatments, and road construction, renovation, and decommissioning prescriptions, botany and fuels mitigation measures) is described in the attached "Implementation Prescription." Thinning is not proposed in the Riparian Reserve land use allocation adjacent to the Siuslaw River. **Location** T. 19S, R. 5W, Section 33 Will. Meridian, Late Successional Reserve and Riparian Reserve land use allocation.

**B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans**

- Eugene District Resource Management Plan (RMP), June 1995, as amended.
- Upper Siuslaw Landscape Plan Environmental Assessment, July 2009.

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs, because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions: *"Plan and implement silvicultural treatments inside Late-Successional Reserves that are beneficial to the creation of late-successional habitat.*

*"If needed to create and maintain late-successional forest conditions, conduct thinning operations in forest stands up to 80 years of age. This will be accomplished by pre-commercial or commercial thinning of stands regardless of origin (planted after logging or naturally regenerated after fire or blowdown)" (RMP p30). Exclude timber harvest in Riparian Reserves adjacent to river segments found to be suitable for inclusion as components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The Siuslaw River has been found to be suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic River System (RMP ROD p78)*

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

The proposed action is covered by the Upper Siuslaw Landscape Plan Environmental Assessment – July 2009.

Other NEPA documents and other related documents that are relevant to the proposed action include:

- Eugene District RMP/Environmental Impact Statement -November 1994 and Record of Decision –June 1995.
- Record of Decision and Standards and Guidelines for Amendments to the Survey and Manage Protection Buffer, and other Mitigation Measures Standards and Guidelines. January 2001.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Opinion for the Upper Siuslaw Landscape Plan FY 2010.
- USFWS (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). 2009. Biological Opinion Regarding the Effects of Habitat Modification Activities within the North Coast Province, FY2009-2010, proposed by the Eugene District, Bureau of Land Management; Salem District, Bureau of Land Management; Siuslaw National Forest on the Northern Spotted Owl (*Strix occidentalis caurina*), Marbled Murrelet (*Brachyramphus marmoratus*) and their Critical Habitats. FWS Reference Number 13420-2009-F-0012. 151 pp.
- Late-Successional Reserve Assessment for the Oregon Coast Province - Southern Portion – RO267, RO268. 1997
- Siuslaw Watershed Analysis. 1996.
- Farman Flats project analysis file.

#### D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

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

The proposed action for thinning approximately 204 acres is part of the proposed action analyzed in the Upper Siuslaw Landscape Plan Environmental Assessment and is contained within the EA analysis area. The current proposed action implements the following specific actions in the selected alternative:

*“Trees identified for harvest would generally be from the smaller diameter classes, varying spacing to reserve the larger, more vigorous trees to a specified basal area. Thinning would be to a Relative Density (RD) in the mid-30s which is expected to result in a residual canopy closure of 45 to 60 percent.”*

*Roads would be constructed or renovated/improved as needed. Approximately 20 to 30 miles of construction and approximately 170 to 190 miles of renovation/improvement would occur (page 16).*

*For LSR lands, all newly constructed and non-inventoried roads used for harvest activities; renovated/improved roads within late successional stands that are natural surface or have been rocked to facilitate harvest activities; other existing roads that are not needed for future management will be decommissioned using the design features listed in the EA.*

Farman Flats consists of approximately 204 acres that are about 41 to 49 years of age (at the time of the EA analysis baseline, p. 8). The proposed action would thin the stands to an RD of 34 and a basal area of approximately 120. Approximately 40 percent canopy closure will be maintained post treatment. Approximately 4310 feet of new road will be constructed and 14997 feet of road will be renovated or improved.

Approximately 17,776 feet of road would be decommissioned (see the implementation prescription for design features).

**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?**

The Upper Siuslaw Landscape Plan Environmental Assessment analyzed four alternatives in addition to the no action alternative. The alternatives analyzed a variety of thinning prescriptions and include a range of alternatives from considering limited road construction in LSR lands and spotted owl critical habitat units to building new roads as needed. The types of roads to be decommissioned varied between alternatives to reflect the variety of decommissioning opportunities that may exist. Comments received were taken into consideration both before and after the alternatives were analyzed. No new environmental concerns, interests, resource values, or circumstances have been revealed since the EA was published that would indicate a need for additional alternatives.

**3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the proposed action?**

There is no significant new information or circumstance relative to the analyses in the Upper Siuslaw Landscape Plan EA (USLP EA) and the current proposed action. The affected environment and environmental effects were considered in the EA; there is no new information or circumstances relative to these analyses. We received one comment about the consideration of carbon sequestration during the public comment period for the USLP EA. The appropriate scale at which carbon storage estimates should occur are at the Resource Management Plan or larger. Since the USLP EA tiered to the 1995 RMP, the analysis has been completed in the EIS that accompanied the 1995 RMP. The 1995 RMP did consider increases in carbon dioxide release from forest management activities. The two forest management activities that were considered as having a measureable impact (based on research available at that time) included large scale clear cutting of old growth (age class 200+) and prescribed burning after harvest of those acres. The total increase in atmospheric carbon would not exceed 0.01

percent due to those actions under the 1995 Proposed Resource Management Plan (pages 4-9; 4-10 1995 FEIS). All other forest management actions were considered to have much less of an impact and therefore were not considered. In comparison, the current proposed action under the Upper Siuslaw Landscape Plan Environmental Assessment is a thinning project and does not include clear cut harvest of old growth and associated prescribed burning. The proposed action includes piling of slash within 25 feet of certain roads. Slash from these piles would be used to scatter over decommissioned roads, and the remaining material would be covered and burned to increase safety in the event of wildfire occurrences. The carbon released from these slash piles is not expected to have measurable impacts to increases in carbon dioxide in the atmosphere due to the small quantity and short duration of burning that is to occur. The conclusions in the 1995 RMP/EIS analysis of carbon release support that thinning as described in this proposed action would have a negligible effect on the global carbon pool, in addition, carbon sequestration due to thinning would provide beneficial consequences due to carbon uptake by increased growth of conifers after thinning. New information or circumstances about carbon release with regards to the proposed action is considered to be insignificant.

The USLP EA has been issued a Biological Opinion by the USFWS which is consistent with the 2008 northern spotted owl recovery plan. Additional details are provided in the Farman Flats Project Analysis File.

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

The Upper Siuslaw Landscape Plan EA analyzed the effects of thinning on Critical Habitat for Spotted Owls and Marbled Murrelet habitat (pages 35-36). The ACS objectives analyzed the effects of road use and improvements by the proposed action. The methodology and analytical approach used in the EA are appropriate for the current proposed action.

**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?**

There is no new information or circumstance that would alter the effects analysis in the Upper Siuslaw Landscape Plan EA.

The Upper Siuslaw Landscape Plan EA analyzed direct and indirect impacts of the proposed action; the current project consists of treatments that were described in the proposed action for the EA. The EA concluded that thinning the stands would improve growing conditions and improve the quality of habitat for spotted owls and marbled murrelets. The EA analysis concluded that dispersal habitat within known owl current owl home ranges would be thinned but would not be downgraded and will maintain the ability of the stand to function as dispersal habitat or not limit the ability of an owl to disperse through the landscape. Current levels of dispersal habitat within known owl home ranges in the Area of Concern (AOC) will be maintained and non-dispersal habitat within those owl home ranges will be thinned (EA pp. 34). The current proposed action is not located in the AOC. Thinning and associated activities would result in slash creation in the short-term increasing fire risk, followed by a long-term reduction in the risk of severe fire, relative to leaving stands unthinned (EA pp. 42). Road renovation, new road construction, and log haul would produce negligible, if any, sediment delivery to streams, because of road improvements such as replacement of stream crossing culverts and cross drains (EA pp. 29). Stream buffers will protect streams from sediment that may be generated from logging operations (EA pp. 30). Reduction in canopy closure from thinning, road renovation and new road construction could result in some further establishment and spread of noxious weeds; however, weed levels will decrease as the canopy recovers and shade is restored to these sites. Weed introductions will be minimized by cleaning of vehicles prior to entry into the stand (EA pp. 38).

The site specific effects of the current proposed action are consistent with the effects analysis in the Upper Siuslaw Landscape Plan EA. The stand conditions in the project area for the current proposed action are consistent with those anticipated in the Upper Siuslaw Landscape Plan (EA p. 33-37). Portions of the project overlap a northern spotted owl home range; however, thinning

will occur outside the nest patch and core area of this owl home range. Dispersal habitat thinned would continue to function as owl dispersal habitat since the silvicultural prescriptions for these units maintain at least a 40% canopy cover and no suitable habitat will be thinned. There will be no thinning within the disruption distance of the known owl site. As analyzed in the EA, approximately 120 linear feet per acre of coarse woody debris greater than 12 inches in diameter and 20 feet in length will be felled and left on site; 3 trees (12 inch dbh) per acre (approximately 2.38 square feet per acre) would be left on site as snags after girdling. Critical Habitat for spotted owls and marbled murrelets is not being thinned. Thinning will occur within the 2012 proposed critical habitat, consultation for the Upper Siuslaw Landscape Plan Biological Opinion has been re-initiated. There is no marbled murrelet potential nesting structure within the thinning units. Since thinning would occur within 100 yards of adjacent occupied marbled murrelet habitat, there will be a 2 hour daily timing restriction between April 1 and September 15. Site visits and surveys did not identify any unique conditions (such as special habitats or special status species), and there are no specially designated areas (such as ACECs or RNAs) in the project area. Approximately 4,310 feet of new road will be constructed which is slightly above the average feet per acre (17 feet per acre) of new road construction for the entire planning area. Approximately 14,997 feet of road will be renovated or improved well within the average feet per acre (111 feet per acre) of road renovation or improvement for the entire planning area analyzed in the Upper Siuslaw Landscape Plan EA; "approximately 20 to 30 miles of construction and approximately 170 to 190 miles of renovation/improvement would occur (page 16)". Additional details are provided in the Farman Flats project analysis file.

**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)?**

The Upper Siuslaw Landscape Plan EA analyzed the cumulative impacts of the proposed action within the watershed. The EA concluded that thinning would benefit wildlife species on LSR lands and would maintain spotted dispersal habitat on Matrix lands. Heavy thinning on approximately 325 acres in the LSR would improve the quality of habitat for spotted owls and murrelets in the long term, however there is no heavy thinning included in the current proposed action (EA pp. 36). Road improvements will be implemented to accommodate haul during the wet season. Thinning and associated road construction (such as the current proposed action) would not contribute to any cumulative impacts to fish and aquatic resources (EA pp. 29-30). Coarse wood and snags would be created to improve habitat for wildlife. Road decommissioning would occur where wildlife and fish habitat may benefit from it.

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

Public involvement for the Upper Siuslaw Landscape Plan EA has been adequate. Scoping was completed before the analysis for the EA began with a letter, describing the proposed project and project area and was mailed to interested parties on March 20, 2007. The EA and preliminary FONSI were made available for a 30 day public review on December 10, 2008; three comments were received. One comment suggested a "hybrid" alternative combining Matrix thinning as described in Alternative B and LSR heavy thinning as described for Alternative D. The EA analyzed thinning in the Matrix and heavy thinning on LSR lands; the proposed action includes both treatments. One other comment indicated the inadequate analysis of hardwood conversions included in the proposed action. Hardwood conversions will be analyzed in a separate NEPA document and are not part of the proposed action in the EA. The third comment requested the consideration of the consequences of thinning on carbon sequestration; this has been addressed in the third category of the NEPA adequacy criteria. BLM did not receive any protests following the publication of the Decision Record.

BLM notified the Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians, and the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde, of the Upper Siuslaw Landscape Plan EA during the scoping process, requesting information regarding tribal issues or concerns relative to the project. BLM also sent the tribes copies of the EA and no responses were received.

BLM has consulted with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). BLM completed formal consultation under the Endangered Species Act with the USFWS on effects of the Farman Flats

project on the northern spotted owl, and marbled murrelet. The current proposed action is consistent with the description of the action in the Upper Siuslaw Landscape Plan Biological Opinion issued by the USFWS in 2009. Because the current proposed action would have no effect on coho salmon and its designated critical habitat, as well as no adverse effect on Essential Fish Habitat, consultation with NOAA Fisheries is not required.

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

<b>NAME</b>	<b>SPECIALTY</b>
Steve Steiner	Hydrologist
Teague Mercer	Hydrologist
Karin Baitis	Soil Scientist/ Road Decommissioning
Gary Cairns	Engineer/Roads/ Road Decommissioning
John Moore	Wildlife Biologist
Sharmila Premdas	Landscape Planner/NEPA
Leo Poole	Fish Biologist
Clint Foster	Silviculturist
Mark Stephen	Silviculturist
Dave Reed	Fuels Specialist
Doug Goldenberg	Botanist
Luis Palacios	Logging Systems Forester
Janet Zentner	Team Lead
Peter O'Toole	Planning Forester
Tom Jackson	GIS

**PREPARED AND REVIEWED BY**

<u>/s/ Sharmila Premdas</u>	<u>9/18/2012</u>
NEPA Coordinator	Date

**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.

<u>/s/ Sharmila Premdas</u>	<u>9/18/2012</u>
Alan D. Corbin	Date
Field Manager	
Siuslaw Resource Area	

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
EUGENE DISTRICT OFFICE

DECISION RECORD  
Documentation of NEPA Adequacy  
Farman Flats Density Management Project  
**DOI-BLM-OR-E050-2010-0007-DNA**

Decision:

It is my decision to implement the Farman Flats Density Management Project as described in the Documentation of NEPA Adequacy **DOI-BLM-OR-E050-2010-0007-DNA** and in the attached implementation prescription.

The proposed action has been reviewed by Resource Area Staff and appropriate project Design Features specified in the Upper Siuslaw Landscape Plan EA, which analyzed these actions, will be incorporated into the proposal. As documented in the Determination of NEPA Adequacy, the proposed action is a feature of the selected alternative analyzed in the Upper Siuslaw Landscape EA. As documented in the Finding of No Significant Impact for the Upper Siuslaw Landscape Plan, the proposed action involves no significant impact to the human environment and no further analysis is required.

The Eugene District initiated planning and design for this project to conform and be consistent with the Eugene District's 1995 Resource Management Plan (RMP).

BLM issued a record of decision in July, 2007 to amend the plans within the Northwest Forest Plan area to remove the survey and manage mitigation measure.

In January, 2008 a lawsuit was filed, and in December, 2009 the presiding judge issued an Order granting Plaintiffs motion for partial summary judgment.

A settlement agreement between the parties was approved by the court on July 6, 2011. The agreement stipulates that projects within the range of the northern spotted owl are subject to the survey and manage standards and guidelines in the 2001 ROD without subsequent 2001-2003 Annual Species Reviews as modified by the 2011 Settlement Agreement. The Settlement Agreement modifies the 2001 Survey and Manage species list; establishes a transition period for application of the species lists; acknowledges existing exemption categories (2006 Pechman Exemptions); and establishes exemptions from surveys for certain activities. The settlement agreement is in effect until the BLM conducts further analysis and decision making pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act and issues a Record of Decision to supersede the Survey and Manage mitigation measure.

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 Record of Decision eliminating the Survey and Manage mitigation measure. 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 of large wood, channel and floodplain reconstruction, or removal of channel diversions; and*

*D. The portions of the 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 Court’s December 17, 2009 ruling, the Pechman exemptions are still in place. 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. Nevertheless, I have reviewed the Farman Flats Thinning Project in consideration of both the December 17, 2009 and October 11, 2006 order. Because the Farman Flats Thinning Project entails no regeneration harvest and entails thinning only in stands less than 80 years old, I have made the determination that this project meets Exemption A of the Pechman Exemptions (October 11, 2006 Order), and therefore may still proceed to be offered for sale even if the District Court sets aside or otherwise enjoins use of the 2007 Survey and Manage Record of Decision since the Pechman exemptions would remain valid in such case. The first notice for sale will appear in the newspaper on September 26, 2012.

Administrative Remedies:

The forest management decision to be made on the action described in the Documentation of NEPA Adequacy is subject to protest under 43 CFR subpart 5003. Under 43 CFR 5003.2 subsection (b), the decision will be published in local newspaper(s) and this notice shall constitute the decision document. Under 43 CFR 5003.3 subsection (a), protests may be filed with the authorized officer within 15 days of the publication date of this decision. Under 43 CFR 5003.3 (b), protest(s) filed with the authorized officer shall contain a written statement of reasons for protesting the decision. A decision on this protest would be subject to appeal to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, although, under 43 CFR 5003.1 subsection (a), filing a notice of appeal under 43 CFR part 4 does not automatically suspend the effect of a decision governing or relating to forest management under 43 CFR 5003.2 or 5003.3.

Authorizing Official:

/s/ Alan D. Corbin  
Alan D. Corbin  
Field Manager  
Siuslaw Resource Area

9/18/2012  
Date

**Upper Siuslaw  
Project Implementation Prescription  
Farman Flats Timber Sale- Tract No. E-10-571  
T. 19 S., R. 7 W., Sec. 27**

**Silviculture**

**Late Successional Reserve Treatment**

- Thin approximately 204 acres in Late Successional Reserve (LSR).
- Vary the leave tree spacing as needed to generally reserve the larger diameter, more vigorous trees.
- Select conifer leave trees to reserve an average of 103 trees/acre.
- Retention of target basal area will average 120 ft<sup>2</sup> basal area/acre, Curtis RD = 34, crown closure of 56%.
- Douglas-fir leave trees shall be of good form and relatively free of defect.
- Western redcedar would generally be retained except for safety reasons or when encountered in small-scale pockets of atypical proportions to those encountered during stand exams.
- Hardwoods, yew trees and snags shall be reserved where possible; where felled for safety reasons, they shall be retained on site.
- Non-merchantable tree tops and limbs shall not be yarded to the landing, where possible, and shall be left on site to contribute to soil productivity.
- Upon completion of yarding operations, approximately 120 linear feet per acre of coarse woody debris greater than 12 inches in diameter and 20 feet in length will be felled and left on site.
- Upon completion of yarding operations, three trees per acre shall be girdled to hasten the development of snags.

**Riparian Reserve Treatment**

- Thin approximately 73 acres in Riparian Reserve (RR) using the same prescription as adjacent LSR.
- Buffer the impounded areas on Streams 27-5 and 27-9 with a no-treatment buffer of 75 feet (slope distance) on each side of the impounded area, measured from the edge of the harvestable timber, the slope change, stream bank, bank-full width, or wetland areas, whatever is greatest.
- Buffer Streams 27-9 and 27-17 south of their crossings of Road Nos. 19-7-27.2 and 19-7-27.71 with a no-treatment buffer of 75 feet (slope distance) on each side of the stream. The 75-foot measure shall be taken from the bank-full width (ordinary high water line), not the centerline flagging.
- Buffer all other streams with a no-treatment buffer of 75 feet (slope distance) on each side.
- Coarse woody debris creation shall be the same as adjacent LSR.
- Tree girdling for snag development shall be the same as adjacent LSR.

**Logging Systems**

**Cable Yarding Design Features – approx 180 acres**

- All cable yarding would be to designated or approved landings.
- To minimize impacts, spacing of cable corridors should be kept to 150 feet apart at one end and limited to 12 feet in width (a cable system capable of 75 foot lateral yarding would be used).
- Minimum one-end suspension is required. Intermediate supports may be necessary to achieve the required suspension.
- Full suspension is required when yarding over streams. Corridor trees cut from reserve area will be left on site.
- Cable yarding corridors would be made erosion resistant if needed where severe gouging has occurred.
- Cable yarding corridors over concave slopes above stream headwalls should be perpendicular to the stream, where possible.

### Ground Based Yarding Design Features – approx 97 acres

- Operations would occur when soil moisture content provides the most resistance to compaction (generally less than 25%--during the dry season, typically, July 1 to October 15, as approved by the Authorized Officer in consultation with the Soil Scientist).
- Skid trails would be limited to slopes less than 35% with approval from the Authorized Officer.
- All skid trails would be predesignated and approved by an Authorized Officer.
- Use existing skid trails wherever possible.
- Preplan (map) and designate (flag) skid trails to occupy less than 10% of the unit. This can be accomplished by a minimum 150 foot spacing between skid trails, and limiting width of skid trails to 12 feet.
- Use of low ground pressure (<6 psi) ground-based yarding equipment would be limited to a single pass when operating outside designated primary skid trails, utilizing downed slash to minimize soil disturbance.
- Require felling of trees to lead to the skid trails and maximize winching distances.
- Logs would be skidded to designated or approved landings.
- Till skid trails and landings during the dry season and place slash and brush on trails. If tillage cannot be accomplished the same operating season, all trails would be left in an erosion resistant condition and blocked.
- When logging with ground-based equipment within 210 feet of any stream, skid trails shall be located at least 75 feet from the posted boundary. Within 210 feet of any stream, ground-based yarding equipment shall not leave the designated trail.

### Road Construction, Renovation, and Improvement

#### 1. Roads to be surfaced with crushed rock:

##### a) New construction:

19-7-27.11 = 7.90 sta.

19-7-27.12 = 7.35 sta.

19-7-27.13 = 5.50 sta.

Landing A

20.75 sta. new construction, subgrade to a 16' width, outsloped where possible, surfaced with crushed rock.

##### b) Renovation:

19-7-27.4 = 58.08 sta.

58.08 sta. of renovation work will consist of grading the existing subgrade to a 16' width and surfacing with crushed rock, and adding culverts.

##### c) Improve:

19-7-27.10 = 9 sta.

9 sta. of improvement work will consist of brushing, grading and/or widening the existing subgrade to a 16' width and surfaced with crushed rock.

#### 2. Roads with natural surface:

##### a) New construction:

Spur A = 1.95 sta.

Spur B = 2.10 sta.

Spur C = 13 sta.

Spur D = 7.4 sta.

Landing B

Truck Turnaround

24.45 sta. new construction, subgrade to a 14' width, outsloped where possible.

- b) Renovation:  
19-7-27.1 = 54.91 sta.  
19-7-27.2 = 50.45 sta.  
19-7-27.71 = 10 sta.  
19-7-27.5 = 34 sta. (combined private and BLM)  
19-7-27.72 = 10.30 sta.

159.66 of renovation work will consist of brushing, scarifying or grading and/or widening the existing subgrade to a 14' width, and natural surfaced.

3. Logger's choice landings/spurs requested by Purchaser are subject to approval by the Authorized Officer.
4. Wet weather yarding, decking, and hauling will be allowed on Road Nos. 19-7-27.10, 19-7-27.11, 19-7-27.12, 19-7-27.13, and Landing A if rocked. Road Nos. 19-7-27.4 and 19-7-28.1 may be used for wet weather haul with 6 additional culverts on Road No. 19-7-27.4.  
  
Wet weather hauling will be allowed on Road No. 19-7-28 with an application of rock from milepost 0.25 (junction with 19-7-28.2) to milepost 0.54 and an additional culvert installed at milepost 0.43 (recommended by hydrology). This work is expected to be accomplished under a timber sale sold previous to this sale.
5. Dry season haul may occur over the low water crossing on Road No. 19-7-27, the stream crossings of 19-7-27.1, and the length of 19-7-27.2.
6. Summary: 45.20 stations new construction (not including roadside landings); 217.74 stations renovation; 9 stations improvement
7. On Road No. 19-7-27.1 at Stream 27-9, the current crossing will be maintained and used for haul. On Road No. 19-7-27.1 at Stream 27-5, a temporary bridge will be overlayed atop the existing crossing.

### **Road Decommissioning**

#### Decommissioning of Road 19-7-27.1

Remove the temporary bridge; remove the two stream crossing barriers at Streams 27-5 and 27-9; restore the stream banks upon removal of the two stream crossing barriers; and block Road No. 19-7-27.1 at the junction with Road No. 19-7-27.4.

#### Decommissioning measures

All decommissioning shall be completed during the dry season.

- (aa) Purchaser shall decompact all natural surfaced roads and skid trails with decompaction equipment, such as a track mounted excavator, during the dry season.
- (bb) Purchaser shall construct drainage dips, waterbars and/or lead-off ditches, as directed by the Authorized Officer. On Road 19-7-27.1 south of its junction with Road No. 19-7-27.9, and on Roads No. 19-7-27.2 and 19-7-27.71, cross drains and culverts will be removed and placed at a location to be determined so that BLM road maintenance may access the pipes for other projects.
- (cc) Purchaser shall place logging slash on surfaces where available.
- (dd) Purchaser shall block at entry points using stumps, slash, and/or cull logs, or earthen barricades, as directed by the Authorized Officer.

Road Number	Road Rocking	If Not Rocked				If Rocked		
		(aa)	(bb)	(cc)	(dd)	(bb)	(cc)	(dd)
		Tilling	Drainage	Logging Slash	Blocking	Drainage	Logging Slash	Blocking
All skid trails	Not Allowed	X	X	X	X*			
19-7-27.1 north of jct. -27.9	Not Allowed		X		X			
19-7-27.1 south of jct. -27.9	Not Allowed	X	X	X	X*			
19-7-27.2	Not Allowed	X	X	X	X*			
19-7-27.5 (0.42 miles BLM)	Not Allowed	X	X	X				
19-7-27.5 (0.22 miles private)	Not Allowed	X	X	X				
19-7-27.71	Not Allowed	X	X	X				
19-7-27.72	Not Allowed	X	X	X	X*			
Spur A	Not Allowed	X	X	X	X*			
Spur B	Not Allowed	X	X	X	X*			
Spur C	Not Allowed	X	X	X	X*			
Spur D	Not Allowed	X	X	X				
19-7-27.13	Required^	X	X	X		X		
19-7-27.10	Required^	X	X	X	X	X		X
19-7-27.11	Required^	X	X	X	X	X		X
19-7-27.12	Required^	X	X	X	X	X		X

\*Location of blocking of Road No. 19-7-27.1 is undetermined at this time due to Right-of-Way and Road Use issues with Roseburg Resources Co. If upon completion of Farman Flats timber sale operations Road No. -27.1 is not blocked at its junction with -27.4, then it shall be blocked at its junction with -27.9 and these roads shall be blocked at their entry points. If -27.1 is blocked at its junction with -27.4, then these roads will not need individual blocking.

^Road rocking required for wet weather haul. Purchaser may buy out of rocking if hauling on this road only during the dry season.

### **Wildlife**

#### **Threatened and Endangered Species**

- Seasonal restrictions for northern spotted owls as follows: None needed.
- Seasonal restrictions for marbled murrelets as follows: In the Special Operating Area shown on the planning map, timber harvest, road construction and road renovation operations shall not begin until two hours after sunrise and shall cease at least two hours prior to sunset each day from April 1 to September 15 of each year, both days inclusive. This restriction may not be waived.

Timber harvest and road building activity “May Affect but is Not Likely to Adversely Affect” spotted owl habitat, “May Affect but is Not Likely to Adversely Affect” the spotted owl due to disturbance, and will have “No Effect” on spotted owl critical habitat.

Timber harvest and road building activity is “Not Likely to Adversely Affect” the marbled murrelet due to disturbance, and will have “No Effect” on marbled murrelet habitat or critical habitat.

#### **Special Status Species**

No Special Status Species or unique habitats were encountered during field reviews of the proposed unit.

## **Fish**

### Threatened and Endangered Species

Oregon Coastal Coho Salmon, a Threatened species, are located in the Siuslaw River, adjacent to the Farman Flats Timber Sale. The Siuslaw has been designated Critical Habitat and Endangered Fish Habitat.

There will be No Effect to coho from timber harvest or road construction activities.

The following measures are required in order to achieve a No Effect determination for haul:

- 1) On Roads No. 19-7-27 and 19-7-27.1, haul would be limited to the dry season.
- 2) Wet weather haul will occur on Road No. 19-7-28, surface rock will be applied from milepost 0.25 (junction with 19-7-28.2) to milepost 0.54 and an additional cross drain installed at milepost 0.43.

## **Botany**

### Threatened and Endangered Species

No federally listed Threatened or Endangered plant species were located during surveys.

### Sensitive Species

No Sensitive Species plants were located during site survey and no mitigations needed.

### Noxious Weeds and Invasive Non-native species

- All yarding and road construction equipment would be cleaned prior to arrival on BLM-managed lands to lessen the spread of noxious weed seed.
- Decommissioned roads would be seeded with native grasses if seed is available.

## **Fuels**

- Scatter roadside and landing piles across roads to be closed after harvest as shown in decommissioning table. Scatter slash in a manner that does not create a deep (>1ft), continuous fuel bed.
- Any piles not scattered across closed roads would be covered and burned. Leaving up to 20% of piles unburned is acceptable.
- Piles would be burned in the late fall when favorable smoke dispersion conditions are common.
- On Road No. 19-7-27.4, slash within 25 feet of the road and less than 9" would be piled, covered, and burned.
- Landing piles on Road No. 19-7-27.1 would be covered and burned; additional piling along this road would not be required.

