

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

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

DOI-BLM-OR-E060-2012-0005a-EA  
2014 Project - Second Show

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) (DOI-BLM-OR-E060-2012-0005a-EA) for the Second Show project, which analyzed the effects of the modified proposed action and alternatives. On the basis of the information contained in the Final EA, and all other information available to me, it is my determination that the implementation of the modified proposed action would not have significant environmental effects. Therefore, an environmental impact statement is not necessary and will not be prepared. This finding is based on my consideration of the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) criteria for significance (40 CFR 1508.27), both with regard to the context and to the intensity of the impacts described in the Final EA.

**CONTEXT**

The action alternatives would occur in the Matrix (General Forest Management Area (GFMA) and Connectivity) and Riparian Reserve Land Use Allocations (LUA) as designated by the 1995 Eugene District Resource Management Plan (RMP). The RMP anticipated that forest management activities would occur in these LUAs as follows:

Matrix (p. 34):

- to produce a sustainable supply of timber and other forest commodities to provide jobs and to contribute to community stability;
- to provide connectivity (along with other allocations such as Riparian Reserves) between Late Successional Reserves;
- to provide habitat for a variety of organisms associated with both late-successional and younger forests;
- to provide important ecological functions, such as dispersal of organisms, carryover of some species from one stand to the next, and maintenance of ecologically valuable structural components, such as down logs, snags, and large trees;
- to provide early-successional habitat.

Riparian Reserve:

- to meet the objectives of the Aquatic Conservation Strategy (p. 18)
- to provide habitat for Special Status Species, SEIS special attention, and other terrestrial species (p. 23).

The action alternatives are in compliance with the RMP, as amended.

Under the action alternatives, treatments would be designed to meet the purposes and needs. Purposes of the actions include: (1) Produce a sustainable supply of timber (RMP, p. 34); (2) to manage the spread of pathogens into adjacent stands (RMP, p. 201); (3) increase the economic productivity of the stand through improvement of stand health<sup>1</sup> (RMP, p. 84); (4) provide connectivity (RMP, p. 34); (5) provide habitat for a variety of organisms associated with both late-successional and younger forests (RMP, p. 34); maintenance of valuable structural components, such as down logs and snags (RMP, p. 34); reduce the risk of stand loss from fire, animals, insects and disease (RMP, p. 84); provide early-successional habitat (RMP, p. 84); and produce a sustainable supply of timber to increase the proportion of merchantable volume, and promote development of desired understory vegetation (RMP, p. 200). Additional direction for road management directs BLM to provide and manage the road system to serve resource management needs (RMP, p. 98).

The purposes of the actions in Riparian Reserves are to provide habitat for Special Status Species and other terrestrial species, and to maintain and restore water quality (RMP, p. 23).

---

<sup>1</sup> For this project, the use of the term "stand health" is meant to refer to the health of the forested stand, including the resilience of trees to disturbance and tree growth and vigor.

The RMP also has management objectives to manage habitat for federally listed species to achieve species recovery in compliance with the Endangered Species Act (p. 52, 58).

## **INTENSITY**

I have considered the potential intensity of the impacts that would result from the modified proposed action relative to each of the ten areas suggested for consideration by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), as detailed below:

**1. Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse.**

The environmental analysis for the Second Show project identified impacts, both beneficial and adverse, for relevant resources in the project area including wildlife, silviculture, botany/weeds, archaeology, recreation, climate change, soils, fisheries, and hydrology. None of the analysis conducted for these resources (which are hereby incorporated by reference) determined effects to be beyond the range of effects analyzed in the Eugene District "Final Proposed Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement" (FEIS) (November 1994), to which this analysis is tiered.

**2. The degree to which the proposed action affects public health and safety.**

No aspect of the modified proposed action would have an effect on public health and safety. Smoke management from prescribed burning and pile burning would adhere to the Oregon Smoke Management Plan (EA, p. 35).

**3. Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity of historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.**

There are no known park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wilderness or wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas (Areas of Critical Environmental Concern) in the project area. Cultural surveys completed for the project area did not identify any cultural or historical resources for protection.

**4. The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.**

The effects of actions planned under the modified proposed action are similar to many other forest management projects implemented within the scope of the 1995 Eugene RMP. No unique or appreciable scientific controversy has been identified regarding the effects of the modified proposed action.

Environmental effects of the project are within the scope of those considered in the 1994 FEIS. The 1994 FEIS projected that the Eugene District would harvest 570 acres (p. xix) annually through regeneration harvest methods. As of May 2014, the District has harvested 3,571 acres (or 35% of the total 10,260 acres projected) of this projection under the 1995 RMP. Harvesting 259 acres would constitute another 2.5% of this projection (Final EA, p. 7).

Effects are expected to be consistent with those of the published literature cited in the Final EA, and are not expected to be highly controversial, in a scientific sense. The public has had the opportunity to comment on this project at public meetings, through formal scoping, and during a formal comment period on the Final EA (p. 4). While comments were received expressing disagreement with the BLM timber management program, none established scientific controversy over the outcome of the preferred alternative.

**5. The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.**

The analysis has not shown that there would be any unique or unknown risks to the human environment not previously considered and analyzed in 1994 FEIS, to which this decision is tiered. Timber harvest is a common practice on lands managed by the BLM in western Oregon. None of the public comments received indicated unique or unknown risks to the human environment.

**6. The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.**

This project neither establishes a precedent nor represents a decision in principle about future actions. The timber management program on BLM managed lands in western Oregon is well-established and this project would not establish a new precedent of management for this program. The modified proposed action is consistent with actions appropriate for the Matrix and Riparian Reserve land use allocations, as designated

by the RMP. The modified proposed action incorporates the principles of Drs. Johnson and Franklin and is informed from past projects incorporating these principles (Pilot projects) in western Oregon. Any future planning efforts would include analysis at that time for significant impacts.

**7. Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.**

There are no cumulatively significant impacts identified by the analysis conducted for the Second Show Final EA. Effects considered include impacts to wildlife (Wildlife Input, p. 21), silviculture (Final EA, pp. 19-20; Silviculture Report, pp. 4-5), botany/weeds (Botany/Weeds Input, pp. 4), recreation (Recreation Input, pp. 1), climate change (Final EA, p. 32), soils (Final EA, p. 35), fisheries (Fisheries Input, pp. 10-11), and hydrology (Hydrology Input, pp. 6-7). These environmental analyses did not reveal any cumulative effects beyond those already in the 1994 FEIS.

**8. The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historic resources.**

There are no features within the planning area that are listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or are significant scientific, cultural, or historic resources. As such, the proposed activities would not affect districts, sites, highways, structures or objects listed in or potentially eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Nor would the activities cause a loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.

**9. The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.**

The Upper Willamette Resource Area initiated consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) for evaluation of effects to the Northern spotted owl. ESA consultation for the Northern spotted owl considered effects to general habitat due to habitat modification, and effects to site occupation and reproduction due to habitat modification, and nesting behavior due to noise disturbance/disruption. Collectively, these considerations result in the overall effects determination of project actions in the Second Show Final EA. Consultation was conducted under a batched Province BA: Biological Assessment of Not Likely to Adversely Affect (NLAA) Projects with the Potential to Modify the Habitat of Spotted Owls - Willamette Planning Province - FY2014. On October 28, 2013, we received a Letter of Concurrence stating that the FWS's "conclusion for informal consultation is that we concur with your evaluation that implementation of these activities at the anticipated levels would not adversely affect spotted owls nor would it adversely affect their critical habitat."

There are no Threatened or Endangered fish species or their critical habitat within the project area (Fisheries Input, p. 2).

There are no Threatened or Endangered botany species within the project area (Botany/Weeds Input, p. 1).

Analysis has also concluded that implementation of the proposed actions would not change the likelihood of and need for listing of any Special Status Species under the ESA as identified in BLM Manual 6840 and BLM OR/WA 6840 policy.

**10. Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.**

The modified proposed action does not threaten to violate any Federal, State, or local laws imposed for the protection of the environment including, but not limited to, the Clean Water Act and Endangered Species Act. The modified proposed action complies with the 1995 Eugene RMP, which provides direction for the protection of the environment on public lands.

