

Finding of No Significant Impacts (FONSI)

Half N Half Commercial Thinning and Density Management

Swiftwater Field Office, Roseburg District
NEPA #: DOI-BLM-OR-R040-2012-0011-EA

January 2015

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Swiftwater Field Office proposes thinning/density management on approximately 987 acres of forest stands 41-62 years old in the Half N Half Commercial Thinning and Density Management Environmental Assessment (EA). Within this EA, there are two proposed timber sales: Halfway Decent (557 acres) and Halfway There (430 acres) (EA, pg. 1). Approximately 13 acres would be cleared or brushed for spur right-of-ways to access the harvest areas (EA, pg. 9).

The Roseburg District initiated planning and design for this project on January 26, 2012 to conform and be consistent with the Roseburg District's 1995 Record of Decision/Resource Management Plan (1995 ROD/RMP). Analysis of the effects of the proposed action tiers to the analytical assumptions and conclusions of the 1994 *Final - Roseburg District Proposed Resource Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement* (PRMP/EIS, USDI/BLM 1994). Analysis of effects and information from the 2008 *Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Revision of the Resource Management Plans of the Western Oregon Bureau of Land Management* is incorporated by reference.

Half N Half includes lands within the General Forest Management Area (GFMA), Riparian Reserve, and Late-Successional Reserve (LSR) land use allocations. The Riparian Reserve width for fish-bearing streams would be 400 feet (two site potential tree heights on both sides of the stream) in the Upper Smith River Watershed. The Riparian Reserve width for non-fish bearing streams would be 200 feet (one site potential tree height on both sides of the stream).

The proposed units are located on Revested Oregon and California Railroad Lands (O&C Lands). It is anticipated that the proposed timber sales would yield approximately 11million board feet (11 MMBF) of timber in support of local and regional manufacturers and economies (EA, pg. 3).

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 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) generated through the Half N Half project would not dramatically increase the fire risk to the area. The primary carrier of fire is the fine fuels less than one inch 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 (EA, pg. 73). The thinning treatment would reduce the risk of intense fires because it would create a discontinuous horizontal and vertical fuel arrangement that would slow rates of spread should an ignition occur.

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 and in a manner consistent with the requirements of the Clean Air Act (EA, pg. 19).

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 EA, pg. 67).

As described in the EA (pg. 74), cultural resource clearances have been completed and no resources of significant cultural or historical value were identified. Consequently, no effects to cultural resources are anticipated.

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

Yes No

Remarks: The BLM conducts 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 has been afforded several opportunities to comment on projects of a nature similar to 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: Commercial thinning is a common forest management tool regularly conducted by the BLM 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 uncertain. The risks to the human environment are known and not unique. The public has been afforded several opportunities to comment on projects of a nature similar to the current proposal, and none of the comments received indicated unique or unknown risks to 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 cumulative impacts to forest vegetation (pgs. 22-27), wildlife (pgs. 28-48), soils (pgs. 49-54), hydrology, aquatic habitat and fisheries (pgs. 55-66), botany (pgs. 70-71), and carbon storage (pg. 75) were analyzed in the Half N Half EA and were found to not be significant.

Greenhouse gas emissions from the proposed action would be negligible. The EA concluded (pg. 75) that the affects to carbon emissions and carbon storage from the proposed action would be so small that its incremental contribution to global and national emissions would not be discernible from the degree of precision at the global and national emission levels.

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 its responsibilities under the National Historic Preservation Act, in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act under the guidance of the 1997 National Programmatic Agreement and the 1998 Oregon Protocol (EA, pg. 76). Inventories for cultural resources were completed (February 12, 2013) and no cultural resources were discovered. Therefore, there would be no effect to historic properties as a result of the action (EA, pg. 74).

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 Yes No

Fish Species Yes No

Wildlife Species Yes No

Remarks: Surveys did not identify the presence of any federally threatened or endangered botanical species; therefore the proposed thinning would have no effect on listed botanical species (EA, pg. 70).

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 Smith River, Elk Creek, Big Tom Folley Creek, Johnson Creek, Lower Johnson Creek, Cleghorn 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. 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.

Consultation with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) for the Half N Half Commercial Thinning and Density Management project (including the individual sales Halfway Decent and Halfway There) has been completed. The *Biological Opinion on the Roseburg District Bureau of Land Management's Fiscal Year 2014-2015 Program of Activities which may affect Spotted Owls, the Marbled Murrelet and Spotted Owl and Marbled Murrelet Critical Habitat* (FWS 01EOFW00-2013-F-0200) was received from the USFWS dated September 30, 2013. The Biological Opinion (BO) concluded (pg. 116) that the District's 2014-2015 program of activities is ***not likely to jeopardize the continued existence*** of the spotted owl or the marbled murrelet or destroy or adversely modify their Critical Habitats. This conclusion was warranted because:

- The proposed action is not likely to impair the capability of Critical Habitat to provide demographic support or facilitate connectivity among adjacent subunits for the spotted owl (BO, pg. 118).
- The proposed action is likely to maintain a sufficient amount and distribution of dispersal habitat to facilitate natal and adult northern spotted owl dispersal (BO, pg. 118); and
- The action area is expected to continue to fulfill its role in the survival and recovery of the murrelet (BO, pg. 118).

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 the Half N Half Commercial Thinning and Density Management project would comply with all applicable Federal, State, and local laws (EA, pg. 5). 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 Half N Half Commercial Thinning and 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 further determined that the effects of the silvicultural treatment would be within those anticipated and already analyzed in either the 1994 PRMP/EIS or the 2008 Final EIS. Therefore, Half N Half Commercial Thinning and Density Management project is in conformance with the management direction from the 1995 ROD/RMP approved by the Oregon/Washington State Director on June 2, 1995.



Max Yager, Field Manager
Swiftwater Field Office

JAN. 22ND 2015
Date