

PLAN MAINTENANCE
FISCAL YEAR 2003

1. The ROD/RMP is maintained to correct an inconsistency between management action/direction and Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) Section 203(a). All Westside ROD/RMPs were intended to be consistent with FLPMA Section 203(a), however, the Roseburg District ROD/RMP through an editing oversight is different in this respect. FLPMA Section 203(a) allows for disposal of lands through sales if they meet one of three criteria. The Roseburg ROD/RMP inadvertently added a requirement that land sales would, under certain circumstances, need to meet two of the three criteria (ROD/RMP page. 68).

The penultimate full paragraph on page 68 of the ROD/RMP is replaced as follows:

Sell BLM-administered lands under the authority of FLPMA Section 203(a) which requires that at least one of the following conditions exists before land is offered for sale:

The tract because if its location or other characteristics is difficult or uneconomical to manage as part of BLM-administered lands and is not suitable for management by another Federal department or agency.

The tract was acquired for a specific purpose and is no longer required for any Federal purpose. Disposal of the tract would serve important BLM objectives. These include but are not limited to:

- Expansion of communities and economic development which cannot be achieved prudently or feasibly on lands other than BLM-administered lands and which outweigh other public objectives.
- Values including but not limited to recreation and scenic values which would be served by maintaining such tract in Federal ownership.

Transfer land to other public agencies where consistent with public land management policy and where improved management efficiency would result.

Minor adjustments involving sales or exchanges may be made based on site-specific application of the land ownership adjustment criteria.

2. The actions that were intended for salvage under the Resource Management Plan are clarified as follows:

The Roseburg District ROD/RMP sets forth the Timber Objective of “Provide for salvage harvest of timber killed or damaged by events such as wildfire, windstorms, insects or disease, consistent with management objectives for other resources.” (ROD/RMP page 60).

For the General Forest Management Area and Connectivity/Diversity Blocks the ROD/RMP provides that “Silvicultural practices include the full range of practices consistent with the Land Use Allocations.” (ROD/RMP pages 150 and 151).

Additional direction is provided for salvage within Late-Successional Reserves and Riparian Reserves in the Resource Management Plan (ROD/RMP pages 153 and 154).

The full range of silvicultural practices, including those pertaining to salvage which were intended to be used in the Resource Management Plan are set forth in Appendix E of the ROD/RMP and are also found in Smith, David M. 1962 The Practice of Silviculture which was incorporated by reference. (ROD/RMP page 154).

Salvage cuttings are made for the primary purpose of removing trees that have been or are in imminent danger of being killed or damaged by injurious agencies other than competition between trees. (Smith 1962, page 210).

Sometimes the mortality caused by the attack of a damaging agency does not take place immediately. This is particularly true where surface fires have occurred because the main cause of mortality is the girdling that results from killing the cambial tissues. As with other kinds of girdling, the top of the tree may remain alive until the stored materials in the roots are exhausted. It is usually a year or more before the majority of the mortality has occurred. It is, therefore, advantageous to have some means of anticipating mortality before it has occurred. The predictions must be based on outward evidence of injury to the crown, roots or stem. (Smith 1962, page 212)

In salvage operations, in addition to dead trees, trees that are dying or at a high risk of mortality may also be harvested. Outward evidence of injury that may cause mortality includes, but is not limited to scorched crown, fire damage that girdles any part of the bole, substantial fire damage at or near the root collar, damage to roots, and indicators of insect attack.

Salvage harvest should include all trees that present a safety hazard to life or property.

All salvage harvest that occurs within an existing road rights-of-way will be conducted for the proper function, purpose and objectives of the rights-of-way. Salvage harvest outside of a rights-of-way will follow management action/direction for the appropriate land use allocation.

There is no requirement to meet green tree retention requirements for the matrix where the extent of dead and dying trees has made this impracticable. Green tree retention requirements in the Matrix will be met in salvage operations to the extent that healthy trees are available for retention.

3. The Beatty Creek Area of Critical Environmental Concern and Research Natural Area (ACEC/RNA) has been increased in size through acquisition of lands through a land exchange for the purpose of blocking up ownership and improving management opportunities. This action was anticipated in the Roseburg District Proposed Resource Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/EIS page 2-36) and is in accordance with management direction for the Beatty Creek ACEC/RNA set forth in the Roseburg District Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan (ROD/RMP page 50).

The Island Creek recreation site has been increased in size through acquisition of lands through a land exchange for the purpose of developing further recreational opportunities. This action was anticipated in the PRMP/EIS (page 2-43) and is in accordance with management direction for the Island Creek recreation site set forth in the Roseburg District Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan (ROD/RMP page 57).

The details regarding these actions are contained in the Beatty Creek/Island Creek Land Exchange environmental assessment (EA OR105-01-06, March 6, 2003) and associated decision record of March 17, 2003. This plan maintenance is effective as of the March 17 Decision Record.

4. From 1996 through 2003, the Roseburg District Monitoring Plan which is contained in Appendix I of the ROD/RMP has undergone a number of refinements and clarifications. These clarifications and refinements to the monitoring plan are part of adaptive management in which the monitoring questions that are no longer relevant are eliminated, needed questions are added or existing questions modified. These refinements all have the purpose to make monitoring as effective and relevant as possible.

The most recent refinement of the monitoring questions, in fiscal year 2003, has been to eliminate pre-implementation monitoring and to rely solely on post-implementation monitoring. This change has resulted from the adaptive management experience in which most projects that received pre-implementation monitoring were still not able to receive post-implementation monitoring as much as five years later because of protests and litigation. As a result, the monitoring information was no longer timely enough to be useful to management.

The current applicable monitoring questions are found in the most recent Annual Program Summary and Monitoring Report.

Ongoing District data base updates are incorporated as plan maintenance.

2004 AMENDMENTS TO THE NORTHWEST FOREST PLAN INCLUDING THE ROSEBURG DISTRICT ROD/RMP

Two amendments to the Northwest Forest Plan were made in 2004. These amendments were accomplished through separate environmental impact statements and records of decision.

Survey and Manage

The Survey and Manage standards and guidelines were removed from the plan through a Record of Decision of March 2004. The species that were included in the Survey and Manage standards and guidelines were referred to in the Roseburg ROD/RMP as "SEIS Special Attention Species". This decision will:

- Continue to provide for diversity of plant and animal communities in accordance with the National Forest Management Act and conserve rare and little known species that may be at risk of becoming listed under the Endangered Species Act.

- Reduce the Agencies' cost, time, and effort associated with rare and little known species conservation.
- Restore the Agencies ability to achieve Northwest Forest Plan resource management goals and predicted timber outputs.

Aquatic Conservation Strategy

The provisions relating to the Aquatic Conservation Strategy (ACS) were clarified through a Record of Decision of March 2004. The Aquatic Conservation Strategy provisions had been interpreted to mean that decision makers must evaluate proposed site-specific projects for consistency with all nine ACS objectives, and that a project could not be approved if it has adverse short-term effects, even if the ACS objectives can be met at the fifth-field for larger scale over the long term. However, the ACS objectives were never intended to be applied or achieved at the site-specific (project) scale or in the short-term; rather they were intended to be applied and achieved at the fifth-field watershed and larger scales, and over a period of decades or longer rather than in the short-term. Indeed, failing to implement projects due to short-term adverse effects may frustrate the achievement of the goals of the ACS.

The decision clarifies the proper spatial and temporal scale for evaluating progress towards attainment of ACS objectives and clarifies that no-project-level finding of consistency with ACS objectives is required. The decision specifically reinforces the principle that projects must be considered in a long-term, fifth field watershed or larger scale to determine the context for project planning and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) effects analysis.

The decision will increase the ability of the Forest Service and the BLM to successfully plan and implement projects that follow Northwest Forest Plan principles and achieve all of the goals of the Northwest Forest Plan while retaining the original intent of the Aquatic Conservation Strategy.

Port-Orford-cedar

In February 2003, the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon ruled that EIS for the Coos Bay District Resource Management Plan did not contain an adequate analysis of the effects of timber sales on the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts on Port-Orford-cedar and its root disease, *P. lateralis*. In order to correct this analysis deficiency and to ensure maintenance of Port-Orford-cedar as an ecologically and economically significant species on Federal lands, BLM and its co-lead and cooperating agencies prepared the January 2004 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS). The Record of Decision for this FSEIS was issued in May 2004. The Record of Decision replaced existing management direction for Port-Orford-cedar with management direction that addresses research, monitoring, education, cooperation, resistance breeding and disease controlling management practices to reduce the spread of the root disease.