

**Klamath Falls Resource Area
Optional Plan Conformance Review/NEPA Compliance Record
and/or Categorical Exclusion Review**

Klamath Falls Resource Area Project File Number - KCER-00-12

Proposed Action Title/Type: Tree Plantation Brushing and Precommercial Thinning (density management thinning)

Location of Proposed Action: West Side of the Resource Area: Summitt Point, Chase Mountain, Kent Circle, Spencer Swamp, Cold Creek, and Buck Mountain (brushing units). East Side: Stukel Mountain (precommercial thinning units). See also attached maps.

Description of Proposed Action: Both brushing and precommercial thinning involve the cutting of competing vegetation around trees selected as residual, or "leave" trees. In precommercial thinnings, vegetation cut is mainly other trees, while brushing units mainly involve the cutting of competing brush. Both brushing and precommercial thinning would be accomplished with hand crews using chain saws.

Applicant (if any): None.

PART 1: PLAN CONFORMANCE REVIEW. This proposed action is subject to the following land use plan:

Klamath Falls Resource Area Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan and Rangeland Program Summary, June 1995.

The proposed action has been reviewed for conformance with this plan (43 CFR 1610.5, BLM MS 1617.3).

Signature of Reviewers: ___/s./ Charles D. Hicks _____

Remarks: _____

PART 2: NEPA REVIEW

A. Categorical exclusion review. This proposed action qualifies as a categorical exclusion under 516 DM 6, Appendix 5.4 C (4). It has been reviewed to determine if any of the exceptions described in 516 DM 2, Appendix 2, apply.

Signature of Reviewers: ___/s./ Charles D. Hicks _____

B. Existing EA/EIS review. This proposed action is addressed in the following existing BLM EA/EIS:

Klamath Falls Resource Area Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan and Rangeland Program Summary (KFRA ROD/RMP/RPS)

Date Approved: **June 1995**

This EA/EIS has been reviewed against the following criteria to determine if it covers the proposed action:

1. The proposed action is a feature of, or essentially the same as, the alternative selected and analyzed in the existing document.
2. A reasonable range of alternatives was analyzed in the existing document.
3. There has been no significant change in circumstances or significant new information germane to the proposed action.
4. The methodology/analytical approach previously used is appropriate for the proposed action.
5. The direct and indirect impacts of the proposed action are not significantly different from those identified in the existing document.
6. The proposed action would not change the previous analysis of cumulative impacts.
7. Public involvement in the previous analysis is appropriate coverage for the proposed action.

Signature of Reviewers: ___/s./ Charles D. Hicks _____

Remarks: References to the proposed action are found on the following pages of the KFRA ROD/RMP/RPS: ROD R-11, B-3, E-6, RMP 2-80, 2-83, 4-13, G-6&7.

PART 3. DECISION. I have reviewed this plan conformance and NEPA compliance record and have determined that the proposed project is in conformance with the approved land use plan and that no further environmental analysis is required. It is my decision to implement the project, as described, with the mitigation measures identified below.

Mitigation Measures/Other Remarks:

