

**DRAFT**  
**Finding of No Significant Impacts (FONSI)**

**Clever Beaver**  
**Density Management**

Swiftwater Field Office, Roseburg District  
NEPA #: DOI-BLM-OR-R040-2010-002-EA

April 19, 2010

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Swiftwater Field Office proposes density management on approximately 301 acres of mid-seral forest stands, 49-60 years old, in the Clever Beaver Density Management Environmental Assessment (EA). In addition, up to approximately 4 acres would be cleared or brushed for spur right-of-ways to access the harvest areas.

Clever Beaver is located in the Upper Smith River and Upper Siuslaw watersheds within the Late Successional Reserve (LSR) land use allocation. It is anticipated that the proposed timber sale would yield approximately 6-7 million board feet (6-7 MMBF) of timber in support of local and regional manufacturers and economies. The units are located in Sections 25, 27, 33, and 35; T20S R06W; Willamette Meridian (W.M.).

**Test for Significant Impacts.**

1. Has significant impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (1))?  
 Yes                       No

**Remarks:** Any impacts would be consistent with the range and scope of those effects analyzed and described in the 1994 *Final - Roseburg District Proposed Resource Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement* (1994 PRMP/EIS), which analyzed the timber management program for the Roseburg District.

2. Has significant adverse impacts on public health or safety (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (2))?  
 Yes                       No

**Remarks:** The additional amount of down woody debris (i.e. four tons per acre) would not dramatically increase the fire risk to the area. The primary carrier of fires is the fine fuels of less than three inches in diameter. These fine fuels generated in the harvest process would mostly degrade within two years after harvest. Therefore, there would be an increase in fire risk in the area for approximately two years before these additional fine fuels degrade (*Clever Beaver Density Management EA*, pgs. 24-25).

Treatment of logging slash by prescribed fire has the potential to affect air quality locally. Burning would be accomplished under guidelines established by the Oregon Smoke Management Plan (*Clever Beaver Density Management EA*, pg. 7). Any impacts to local air quality would be localized and of short duration, consistent with the range and scope of those effects analyzed and described in the 1994 PRMP/EIS (pgs. 4-9 to 4-12).

3. Adversely effects such unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources, park, recreation or refuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers, sole or principal drinking water aquifers, prime farmlands, wetlands, floodplains or ecologically significant or

critical areas including those listed on the Department's National Register of Natural Landmarks (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (3))?

Yes  No

**Remarks:** Unique geographic characteristics (such as those listed above) are absent from the project area and would not be affected.

4. Has highly controversial effects on the quality of the human environment (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (4))?

Yes  No

**Remarks:** The BLM conducts commercial thinning regularly across western Oregon. There is also a wide body of literature describing the environmental effects of such forest management activity. As such, the BLM has concluded that effects would not be highly controversial. The public was afforded several opportunities to comment on the current proposal, and none of the comments received indicated controversy over the nature of the effects on the human environment.

5. Has highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks to the human environment (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (5))?

Yes  No

**Remarks:** The BLM conducts commercial thinning regularly across western Oregon. There is also a wide body of literature describing the environmental effects of such forest management activity. As such, the BLM has concluded that effects would not be highly controversial. The public was afforded several opportunities to comment on the current proposal, and none of the comments received indicated controversy over the nature of the effects on the human environment.

6. Establishes a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (6))?

Yes  No

**Remarks:** The advertisement, auction, and award of a timber sale contract allowing the harvest of trees is a well-established practice and would not establish a precedent for future actions.

7. Is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (7))?

Yes  No

**Remarks:** The impacts to forest vegetation (pgs. 13-15), wildlife (pgs. 16-24), fire and fuels management (pgs. 24-25), soils (pgs. 25-29), hydrology (pgs. 29-34), aquatic habitat and fisheries (pgs. 34-36), botany (pgs. 36-38), and carbon storage (pgs. 38-41) were analyzed in the *Clever Beaver Density Management EA* and were found to not be significant.

Greenhouse gas emissions from the proposed action would be negligible. The EA concluded that the proposed action would result in greenhouse gas emissions that would constitute 0.00002 percent of current total global emissions (1,483 tonnes out of 6.8 billion tonnes) and 0.00009 of current total U.S. emissions (Clever Beaver Density Management EA, pg. 41). This emission would be so small that its incremental contribution to global and national emissions would not be measurable at the level of precision of the global and national emissions.

8. Has adverse effects on 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 historical resources (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (8))?

Yes  No

**Remarks:** The BLM has completed Section 106 responsibilities under the National Historic Preservation Act, in accordance with the 1998 Oregon State Historic Preservation Office protocols (*Clever Beaver Density Management EA*, pg. 42). Inventories for cultural resources were completed (November 2, 2009) and no cultural resources were discovered. Therefore, there would be no effect to historic properties as a result of the action (*Clever Beaver Density Management EA*, pgs. 11, 42).

9. 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 (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (9))?

Botanical Species	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Fish Species	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Wildlife Species	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

**Remarks:** Surveys did not identify the presence of any federally threatened or endangered botanical species; therefore the action would have no effect on listed botanical species (*Clever Beaver Density Management EA*, pg. 36).

The Swiftwater fisheries staff has determined that any impacts to water temperature, substrate/sediment quality, large wood, pool quality, or habitat access within the project area would be non-existent or immeasurable above background levels. Aquatic habitat in Summit Creek, Beaver Creek, Clevenger Creek and their tributaries would be unaffected, except for short-term reductions in the amount of large and small functional wood available to the stream. Due to the high volume of wood already in the streams and the high density of trees in the no-harvest buffers, fish species and populations in the streams in the project area would be unaffected (*Clever Beaver Density Management EA*, pgs. 34-36, 42). Therefore, the proposed project would not have an effect on Oregon Coast coho salmon or its habitat and further consultation with the NOAA Fisheries Service is not required (*Clever Beaver Density Management EA*, pg. 42).

Consultation with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) for the Clever Beaver Density Management project has not yet been completed, but is expected during FY2010. The Project Design Features described in the EA (pgs. 5-11) are consistent with those found in the current 2009-2010 Letter of Concurrence for thinning activities (USFWS Tails#: 13420-2009-1-0109; June 9, 2009). Project Design Features developed for this project through the consultation process are not anticipated to change from those in the 2009-2010 Letter of Concurrence. When consultation for Clever Beaver has been completed, the results will be disclosed in the decision document and Finding of No Significant Information (FONSI).

10. Threatens to violate Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment (40 CFR §1508.27(b) (10))?

Yes  No

**Remarks:** The measures described above ensure that Clever Beaver Density Management would be consistent with all applicable Federal, State, and local laws. The impacts of the silvicultural treatment on the human environment would not exceed those

anticipated by the 1994 PRMP/EIS.

Based on the analysis of potential impacts contained in the environmental assessment, I have determined that Clever Beaver Density Management would not have a significant impact on the human environment within the meaning of Section 102(2) (c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and that an environmental impact statement would not be required. I have determined that the effects of the silvicultural treatment would be within those anticipated and already analyzed in the 1994 *Final - Roseburg District Proposed Resource Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement* (1994 PRMP/EIS) and would be in conformance with 1995 *Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan* (1995 ROD/RMP) for the Roseburg District, approved by the Oregon/Washington State Director on June 2, 1995.

---

Max Yager, Field Manager  
Swiftwater Field Office

---

Date