ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

for

HAND PILING AND HAND PILE BURNING FOR FUEL AND HAZARD REDUCTION

EA# OR-110-01-37

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
MEDFORD DISTRICT
GRANTS PASS RESOURCE AREA

July 2001

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
MEDFORD DISTRICT

EA COVER SHEET

RESOURCE AREA: *Grants Pass* FY & REPORT # EA Number OR-110-01-37

ACTION/TITLE: *Hand Piling and Burning For Fuel and Hazard Reduction*
LOCATION: *Locations throughout the Grants Pass Resource Area*

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Abbie Jossie - Field Manager
Medford District Office, BLM
3040 Biddle Road
Medford, Oregon 97504
(541) 618-2303

INTERDISCIPLINARY PREPARERS	TITLE	RESOURCE VALUES ASSIGNED	INITIAL & DATE
Leanne Mruzik*	Fuel Technician	Team Leader, EA Writer, Fire and Slash Treatments	
Steve Schober*	Forester	Silviculture, Vegetation	
Leslie Welch*	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife, Prime or Unique Lands	
Dave Maurer*	Soil Scientist	Floodplains, Wetlands, Soils, Water	
Linda Mazzu	Botanist	T&E Plants	
Jon Raybourn*	Fisheries Biologist	Fisheries	
Jim Roper	Engineer	Roads	
Jeanne Klein	Recreation Planner	Cultural Resources	

* Project Planning Core Team Member

GRANTS PASS RESOURCE AREA
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
"HAND PILING AND BURNING FOR FUEL AND HAZARD REDUCTION"

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Chapter 1
Purpose of and Need for Action and Proposed Action

A. Introduction and Need for the Proposal

1. Introduction

The purpose of this environmental assessment (EA) is to assist in the decision-making process by assessing the environmental and human affects resulting from implementing the proposed project and/or alternatives. The EA will also assist in determining if an environmental impact statement (EIS) needs to be prepared or if a finding of no significant impact (FONSI) is appropriate.

This EA tiers to the following documents:

(1) the Final EIS and Record of Decision dated June 1995 for the Medford District Resource Management Plan (RMP) dated October 1994;
(2) the Final Supplemental EIS on Management of Habitat for Late-Successional and Old-Growth Forest Related Species Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl dated February 1994;
(3) the Record of Decision for Amendments to Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Planning Documents Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl and its Attachment A entitled the Standards and Guidelines for Management of Habitat for Late-Successional and Old-Growth Forest Related Species Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl (NFP) dated April 13, 1994; and
(4) the Record of Decision and Standards and Guidelines for Amendments to the Survey and Manager, Protection Buffer, and other Mitigation Measures Standards and Guidelines dated January 2001.

2. Purpose and Need for the Proposal

The Grants Pass Resource Area (GPRA) annually conducts a large young stand management program within established plantations. This includes brushing and pre-commercial thinning with associated maintenance brushing. These actions create slash with a consequent increase of the fire hazard. Wildland fire risk and hazard assessment surveys are conducted after silvicultural treatments are completed and are the basis for determining where treatments are needed and most appropriate to reduce the fuel hazard and potential impacts of a wildland fire.

The purpose of the proposed treatment is to reduce the fire and fuel hazard created by these various silvicultural practices by hand piling and pile burning either throughout an entire unit or at strategic locations in a unit (e.g., road sides, ridgetops and along property boundaries adjacent to private land).

B. Project Location and Land Use Allocations

Project locations are scattered throughout the Grants Pass Resource Area. Table 1 (Appendix A) lists the individual units proposed for fuel and hazard reduction treatment and features of each unit. Unit maps are located in Appendix B. Treatment areas are located in the AMA, Matrix, LSR, and

Riparian Reserve land allocations.

C. Scoping Issues Relevant to the Proposal

Several issues of potential concern were raised during the scoping phase of project planning. They are:

1. Air quality concerns and the requirements of the Oregon Smoke Management Plan (OSMP).

2. The proximity of the portions of the GPRA to the OSMP designated non-attainment areas of Grants Pass and Medford/Ashland.

3. Potential for escaped fires as a result of pile burning.

4. Potential impacts to Special Status, Survey and Manage, and T&E species.

5. Potential impacts to Riparian Reserves and water quality.

D. Proposed Action and Alternatives

1. Alternative Action 1: The No Action Alternative

In this EA document the "no-action" alternative is defined as not implementing any aspect of the proposed action alternative. Defined this way, the no action alternative also serves as a baseline or reference point for evaluating the environmental effects of the action alternative. Inclusion of this alternative is done without regard whether or not it is consistent with the Medford District RMP.

The no action alternative is not a "static" alternative. Implicit in it is a continuation of the annual young stand management program throughout the Grants Pass Resource Area without the removal or reduction of the fuels and hazard created.

2. Alternative Action 2: Proposed Action

All pre-commercial thinning and brushing units listed in Table 1 (Appendix A) will receive post treatment hazard and risk determination surveys / assessments after the silvicultural treatment is completed. The entire unit or portions of each unit which are determined to need hazard reduction treatment will have the slash hand piled and the piles burned. Prioritization for treatment is based on hazard and risk priorities and available funding. Factors that influence priority include strategic hazard reduction, distribution and location to private lands and other land management projects.

When only portions of a unit or stand are to be treated, the areas selected for hazard reduction treatment are critical points on the sites such as where the highest potential loss would be experienced if a wildfire occurred, or along areas where a high risk of an ignition source would be present (e.g., along heavily used roads).

The actual extent of slash treatment will be dependent on available funding. It is anticipated that only 10-20% of the total acreage listed in Table 1 will actually receive treatment.

Slash 2' long and less than 6" diameter will be hand piled. Chainsaws may be utilized to reduce the size of the slash to sizes appropriate for hand piling. Maximum pile size would be approximately 5' in diameter by 6' in height. All piles will be covered with a 5' x 5' sheet of 4-mil polyethylene plastic. At least 3/4 of the pile's surface would be covered and the plastic anchored to preserve a dry ignition point. Slash piles will not be placed on logs, stumps, talus slopes, in roadways or drainage ditches. Piles will not be closer than 10' to trees or 25' to a unit boundary.

The density of resultant piles (#/acre) will vary depending on the nature of the individual unit. Typically, the number of piles in pre-commercially thinned and brushed units is approximately 35 to 60 piles/acre with average spacing between each pile ranging from 20' to 30'. Units with brushing alone (no PCT) typically result in approximately 25 to 35 piles per acre with an average spacing between each pile ranging from 30' to 40'.

Ignition of piles will be with drip torches or other hand held devices. Burning would be done in the fall/winter season after significant rainfall has occurred. "Significant rainfall" means one inch in a 48 hour period, or a cumulative amount that wets the litter and duff layer and penetrates the mineral soil layer to 1/4 inch or more. These conditions would typically prevent the spread of fire outside the burning pile and minimize the risk of an escape. A prescribed burn plan would be prepared to address burning objectives and operational concerns. Prescribed burn plans include weather parameters and design features to diminish any potential of fire escape.

All piles would be ignited except those within a designated no treatment zone of a riparian reserve. The number of piles typically consumed is 85 to 95 % of the total piled.

E. Project Design Features

Project design features (PDFs) are included for the purpose of reducing anticipated adverse environmental impacts identified in the scoping process and which might stem from the implementation of the proposed action. This section outlines these PDFs.

1. Air Quality / Smoke Management

To conform with air quality standards and guidelines, all prescribed burning would be managed in a manner consistent with the requirements of the Oregon Smoke Management Plan and the Department of Environmental Quality's Air Quality and Visibility Protection Program. When burn units are adjacent to rural residential areas, burning would be timed to minimize the amount of residual smoke. This can be accomplished by burning when conditions for smoke dispersal are optimal such as during rainy days and periods when atmospheric instability is present.

Patrol and mop-up of burned piles would occur when needed to prevent burned areas from reburning or becoming an escaped fire.

2. Special Status Species and Cultural Resources

Cultural resource surveys, surveys for special status plant and animal species and/or species of concern have been conducted prior to the initiation of the silvicultural treatment. Measures appropriate to protect cultural sites and/or species will be taken. These could include: timing of treatment, buffering of areas to preclude treatment, or no treatment of the area.

To the extent possible, piles would not be located in areas of talus. Piles placed in these areas would not be burned. Piles would not be placed on existing large woody material.

During periods of high temperatures and low ground moisture conditions, mollusc may seek out covered piles as refugia. To reduce potential impacts to mollusc, pile burning would be done when temperatures and ground moisture conditions are conducive to mollusc dispersal away from covered piles. These are conditions similar to those required for safe and efficient pile burning.

Piles would not be burned within 50 feet of the drip line of trees with confirmed active red tree vole nests.

3. Remnant Habitat for Fungi and Bryophytes

As part of this prescription special treatment guidelines for protecting current non-vascular populations of fungi and bryophytes on tree boles and in the canopy will be applied. Habitat for fungi and bryophytes may occur where 16" DBH or greater conifer and hardwood trees exist within a unit. Therefore, in order to protect potential lichen and bryophyte habitat, no hand piling or hand pile burning will be implemented closer than 10' from the boles of any trees with a 16"+ DBH (all land allocations).

4. Riparian Reserve Treatment

The presence of class 1-4 streams in the proposed treatment units are indicated on Table 1 (Appendix A) and on unit maps in Appendix B. Riparian reserve widths are those of the Northwest Forest Plan:

Fish-bearing streams (stream classes 1 & 2) - 300 feet or 2 site potential tree heights from the edge of the stream (slope distance).
Permanently flowing non-fish-bearing streams (stream class 3) - 150 feet or 1 site potential tree slope distance from the edge of the stream.
Seasonally flowing or intermittent streams (stream class 4) - 100 feet slope or 1 site potential tree distance from the edge of the stream channel.
Lakes and natural ponds - 300 feet or 2 site potential trees slope distance from the outer edge of the body of water.
Constructed ponds and reservoirs and wetlands greater than one acre - 150 feet slope distance from the outer edge of the body of water or wetland.

Slash piling and burning would be done within the riparian reserves except as follows:

- For stream classes 1 and 2, a 50' no treatment buffer would be retained adjacent to the

stream.
- A 25' no treatment buffer would be retained along Class 3 and 4 streams and other riparian areas.
- These buffers would extend from the edge of the riparian vegetation or, if no riparian vegetation exists, from the edge of the stream channel and would be delineated during project implementation.

Due to differences in vegetation and silvicultural treatment, pile density in riparian reserves is typically 5 to 10% lower than the upland areas. The amount of slash generated may necessitate placing a hand pile within a no treatment zone area in order to remove the fuel up to the no treatment zone line. Hand piles within riparian reserves would be ignited, except those within the no treatment zones.

5. Seasonal Operation Constraints

Seasonal operating constraints would be per the Medford District RMP and USFWS Biological Opinion #1-7-96-F-392 for BLM silviculture projects 1996 through 2005:

Spotted Owls - No work involving chainsaws will be permitted within 0.25-mile of an known active spotted owl nest or activity center between March 1 and June 15. Units with this characteristic (seven units) are indicated on Table 1. (Note: The spotted owl related operating season is less restrictive than that required in the RMP, however, the fact that it is specifically approved by the USFWS supports it being treated as a permissible exception.)

Marbled Murrelet - Work involving chainsaws will be permitted within 0.25-mile of known occupied marbled murrelet sites, or unsurveyed suitable marbled murrelet habitat, no earlier than two hours after sunrise and no later than two hours before sunset from April 1 - September 15.

Bald Eagle - Work activities within 1/4 mile non line-of-sight or ½ mile line-of-sight of active bald eagle nests would be restricted to between January 1 - August 1.

Peregrine falcons - Avoid disturbance to pairs between February 1 - August 1 (RMP).

Other raptors - Between March 1 and July 15 and within 1/4 mile of nest sites or activity centers, no disturbances that may disturb or interfere with nesting (RMP).

Seasonal operating restrictions will also be employed to minimize the potential to erosion and damage to natural surface roads. Table 1 identifies those units accessed by natural surfaced roads where this will apply. Operations on these units will not be permitted when conditions are such that damage to natural surface roads would occur.

6. Port-Orford Cedar Root Disease Restrictions

Port-Orford cedar as well as the pathogen *Phytophthora lateralis* (*PL*) are present in some of the proposed treatment units (See Table 1). Therefore measures to prevent the spread of *PL* will employed: Units with Port-Orford Cedar present and which are un-infested and free of the

pathogen *Phytophthora lateralis* (PL) will be hand piled and burned first. Infested units will be hand piled and hand piled burned last.

Units have been surveyed prior to silvicultural treatment to determine presence or absence of POC and/or *Pl*. Operations in units with POC infected with *Pl* (21 units) will be confined to the dry season or periods when roads and soils are dry. The dry period is typically June 15 to Oct. 15. Within the dry season, no work would be permitted during rain events (when water puddles on the road).

Chapter 2
Environmental Consequences

A. Introduction

Only substantive site-specific environmental changes that would result from implementing the proposed action or alternatives are discussed in this chapter. If an ecological component is not discussed, it should be assumed that the resource specialists have considered affects to that component and found the proposed action or alternatives would have minimal or no affects. Similarly, unless addressed specifically, the following were found not to be affected by the proposed action or alternatives: air quality; areas of critical environmental concern (ACEC); cultural or historical resources; Native American religious sites; prime or unique farmlands; floodplains; endangered, threatened or sensitive plant, animal or fish species; water quality; wetlands/riparian zones; wild and scenic rivers; and wilderness areas. In addition, hazardous waste or materials are not directly involved in the proposed action or alternatives.

B. Effects of the Proposed Action

1. Soils and Water

a. Affected Environment

Units proposed to be treated are located in most fifth field watersheds in the Grants Pass Resource Area. Removal of fuels, hand piling, and burning will, for the most part, be done outside of designated no treatment zones (NTZ) within the riparian reserves. Occasionally a hand pile would occur within the NTZ but none of these piles would be burned. Riparian reserve streams within the project units are predominately class 3 and 4 with a few fish-bearing streams. These streams are predominately Rosgen A or AA+ streams in sloping draws.

b. Environmental Consequences

1) Alternative 1: No Action

The heightened wildland fire hazard due to the recent addition of thinning / brushing slash results in an increased likelihood of damaged soils from hot fire occurrences in the future. Hot fires can cause highly reduced organic matter content in the upper mineral soil and on the soil surface. This could have two consequences on soil and water quality:

a) Increased erosion and sedimentation. Sediment would reach class 3 and 4 streams and would reach fish streams in pulses depending upon precipitation rates following fire. Revegetation and new plant growth would slowly take place (see 2 below) and sediment quantities to the stream system would diminish through the short term. In an estimated 10 years sediment rates would return to current levels.

b) Due to loss of duff/litter layer and loss of the organic matter in the upper mineral soil which is an important source of nutrients, soil productivity could substantially decline within these

units.

2) Alternative 2: Proposed Action

Assuming a high average of 60 piles per acre with each pile covering 28 ft^2, burned spots after piles are burned would cover less than 6% of the ground surface. Assuming that most of the burned piles will result in a spot on which the soil has a substantial reduction of organic matter, this would result in reduction of soil productivity for the individual spots. Since the burned spots will occupy less than 6% of the treated units the overall reduction of soil productivity rate will be minimal. Erosion/sedimentation should not be a factor as the spots would be islands surrounded by a matrix of vegetative and litter cover.

After the treatment fire hazard will be reduced, so if wild fire should burn on one of the treated units the fire intensity would be less than without the treatment (No action). Any resultant increase in erosion/sedimentation would thus likely be far less than without the treatment. Also the resulting decrease in soil productivity would likely be far less than without the treatment.

At the 5th and 6th field watershed level, cumulative effects of the proposed treatment on additional stream sediment over the no action or background levels would not likely be measurable.

2. Fire and Fuels

a. Affected Environment

Hazard is defined as the existence of a fuel complex that constitutes a threat of wild land fire ignitions, unacceptable fire behavior and severity, or suppression difficulty. Fuels include dead and down woody debris, and live vegetation. There is a high fire hazard in the units proposed for treatment due to slash from recently thinned / brushed stands.

These stands which have been recently treated for young stand maintenance and are distributed throughout the Grants Pass Resource Area and most fifth field watersheds in the resource area. See Table 1. Thinning / brushing was done to ensure survival, optimal growth and structure enhancement of preferred conifer species and selected hardwoods. Thinning of these stands changed the fuels from a condition of high density live standing fuels to a condition of primarily dead and down surface fuel. Dried fine flashy fuels such as exist in the units are very receptive to fire, contribute to increased fire behavior and typically create a hazardous condition for at least a year.

b. Environmental Consequences

1) Alternative 1: No Action

The wildland fire hazard and hazardous fuel conditions have increased within each unit immediately following the young stand maintenance. Increased fire behavior intensities, flame lengths and rates of spread will result from the added fuel levels. The immediate increase in fire behavior rates of spread continue to exist until the fines (less than 1" in diameter) have fallen off.

The remaining larger fuels (1"- 6" in diameter) will continue to contribute to increased fire intensities and longer flame lengths. Continuation of the young stand management program annually may increase the overall fuel hazard within some of the fifth field watersheds. This increase in hazard will eventually decrease over time depending on the rates of decay and compaction of the fuels.

Over time in a stand there will be a succession of young stand management practices which will contribute to increasing the fuel hazard. This hazard will continue over several years until such time as the slash created compacts or decomposes.

2) Alternative 2: Proposed Action

Wildland fire hazard will be reduced on sites where slash has recently been created. A further reduction in the fire hazard will occur when ignition of the hand piles is completed. Reduction in fuel load will decrease fire intensity, flame length, and rate of spread if a wildfire occurs on the site. These changes in fire behavior reduce the resistance to fire control efforts. Fire suppression forces will have more time to detect and respond to a slower moving fire. The potential for effective direct attack on the fire is greater as the fire is less intense, slower moving, and has lower flame lengths.

3. Wildlife

A range of species utilize the areas proposed for slash treatment. However, there are none that are considered exclusively dependent on the age class of the stands being treated. This discussion will focus on potential impacts on T&E and survey and manage species.

a. Affected Environment

The areas proposed for fuel reduction treatments include stands that are generally less than 30 years old. Stands less than 30 years old do not provide nesting habitat for spotted owls, marbled murrelets, and bald eagles. Bald eagles and spotted owls may occasionally use young stands for foraging. This foraging is most likely associated with edges where adjacent large trees provide perching opportunities and cover.

There are no currently known bald eagle nests currently within 0.5 mile of the proposed treatment units. There are no known peregrine falcon nests within 0.5 mile of the proposed treatment units. There are no known marbled murrelet sites within 0.25 miles of the proposed treatment units.

Survey and manage molluscs with potentially suitable habitat in the project area include *Monadenia chaceana* and *Helminthoglypta hertlieni*. These molluscs are strongly associated with talus and rock outcrops. Coarse woody debris is also an important habitat component for these species. Red tree voles are associated with mature Douglas fir stands with high canopy closure (>50%). Stands within the project area are not representative of suitable red tree vole habitat.

b. Environmental Consequences

1) Alternative 1: No Action

For some species, particularly small mammals, large quantities of slash may provide excellent hiding cover. However, large quantities of slash may also create obstacles to the movement of some terrestrial species and impediments to the foraging efficiency of some raptors.

The greatest potential adverse impact is the increased risk of stand destroying fires associated with high fuel loading. As long as fuel levels remain high, the risk of stands being set back to earlier seral stages remains elevated and the ability to effectively manage for mature forests and associated wildlife species is greatly compromised.

For spotted owls, no impacts to suitable foraging habitat are anticipated as a result of the No Action alternative. This is based primarily on the fact that foraging by spotted owls is typically confined to the edges of young stands. Additionally, their primary prey base includes species not strongly associated with the microhabitats created by slash. The greatest risk is associated with increased fire hazard.

For marbled murrelets, young stands do not provide suitable nesting habitat. Additionally, the areas proposed for fuel reduction treatments are within the marbled murrelet zone 2 (35 - 50 miles) but are within a basin where there have been no murrelet detections and the probability of them occurring is considered very low. Based on this, there are no anticipated impacts to the marbled murrelet.

For bald eagles, there are no known nests within ½ mile of the proposed activities. Additionally, these young stands do not provide preferred foraging habitat. Based on this, there are no anticipated impacts to the bald eagle. The greatest risk is associated with increased fire hazard.

For red tree voles and survey and manage molluscs, there are no anticipated direct impacts associated with the No Action alternative. The greatest risk is associated with increased fire hazard.

2) Alternative 2: Proposed Action

Overall, the greatest benefit associated with the proposed fuel reduction is the ability to more effectively manage stands to achieve mature forest conditions and a decrease in the probability of a catastrophic burn of the sites.

In general, reducing fuel levels would remove habitat for smaller wildlife species strongly associated with this type of ground cover. However, because not all slash piles are entirely burned and not all slash is removed, some of the ground cover benefits provided by slash would remain intact. Estimates are that 5-15% of the targeted fuels will not be consumed.

For spotted owls, fuel reduction will not have broad implications for the suitability of foraging habitat. This is based primarily on the fact that spotted owls typically confine foraging to the edge

of young stands. Additionally, their primary prey base includes species not strongly associated with the microhabitats created by slash. Restricting the operation of power equipment within 1/4 mile of nest sites or activity centers of all known pairs and resident singles between March 1 - June 15 will minimize potential disturbance. Reducing fuel levels will enhance the long term ability to manage these areas for mature forest conditions.

For marbled murrelets, young stands do not provide suitable nesting habitat. Based on this, fuel reductions are not anticipated to result in impacts to the marbled murrelet.

For bald eagles, there are no known nests within ½ mile of the proposed activities. Additionally, these young stands do not provide preferred foraging habitat. Based on this, there are no anticipated direct impacts to the bald eagle. Reducing fuel levels will enhance the long term ability to manage these areas for mature forest conditions.

For red tree voles and survey and manage molluscs, there are no anticipated direct impacts. To minimize the potential for smoke and heat to penetrate the crowns of active red tree vole nest trees, no piles will be burned below these trees. By ensuring that piles are not placed on talus or coarse woody debris, potential impacts to survey and manage molluscs are also minimized. Reducing fuel levels will enhance the long term ability to manage these areas for mature forest conditions.

4. Fisheries

a. Affected Environment

Most of the units proposed for treatment do not contain Riparian Reserves. Most of the Riparian Reserves that are in the proposed treatment units are intermittent streams (Class 4) which are not used by fish. Several streams are perennial (Class 3) but are not used by fish. A few fish-bearing perennial streams (Class 1 and 2) are present within the proposed treatment units and support resident cutthroat and rainbow trout.

Many of the intermittent streams in the project area are ephemeral and flow for only a short time each year. As a result, plants adapted to moist soil conditions may be present only within a few feet of the stream or not at all. Other intermittent streams and some perennial streams are in deep V-shaped channels with no floodplain, allowing riparian vegetation to grow only within a few feet of the stream. Outside of these narrow zones of riparian plants, the vegetation in the Riparian Reserve is similar to that which is found in the drier upland areas outside of the reserves.

The natural stand condition in the areas outside the immediate riparian zone would be an open overstory and sparse understory dominated by fire-adapted species. Due to past logging practices and the exclusion of fire, forest stands in the project area are typically more dense and brushy than under natural conditions and have a higher fuel loading.

b. Environmental Consequences

1) Alternative 1: No Action

Fuel loading in the Riparian Reserves will continue to be high, posing a high wildfire hazard. The risk of a stand-destroying fire would remain high in much of the Riparian Reserve acreage, including miles of streams which would be vulnerable to the effects of wildfire outside the normal range of intensity (see Soil and Water effects).

2) Alternative 2: Proposed Action

No adverse effects to fish or aquatic resources are anticipated from the proposed action. No burning of handpiles will take place within 25 feet of riparian vegetation on non-fish bearing streams and within 50 feet of riparian vegetation on fish-bearing streams. These no treatment buffers close to streams will be sufficient to protect streams from even the small erosion risk associated with removal of the organic soil layer under burned handpiles. The spacing of handpiles to be burned outside the no treatment buffers but within the Riparian Reserve is sufficient to minimize the risk of sediment transport. The resultant fuel loading and fire hazard will be lower than under the no action alternative.

The short and long term effects of the proposed action are beneficial at the site and watershed levels, as wildfire hazard will be reduced in and around Riparian Reserves. No cumulative effects are anticipated from the proposed action as burning will be widely dispersed spatially at the site and watershed levels. In addition, it is unlikely that all of the proposed burning would take place within the same season, but will instead take place over a 2 to 3 year period.

5. Botany

a. Affected Environment

The precommercial thin units have very little native habitat remaining due to past timber management practices. The islands of habitat with larger trees and associated mature understory are small and contain the following special status or survey and manage vascular plant species: *Cypripedium fasciculatum, C. Montanum* and *Frasera umpquaensis.* Small buffers (averaging 50') have been established around these populations to protect the immediate micro-site conditions.

The mycorrhizal connections within the units have been disrupted to the point where fungi habitat may be non-existent, but substrate for lichens and bryophytes may still occur on the legacy trees. Fuel loadings from the PCT treatments will be heavy, creating artificial shade and moist conditions at the ground surface adjacent to plant buffers and legacy trees.

b. Environmental Consequences

1) Alternative 1: No Action

Under the No Action alternative, the fuel loadings will increase the wildfire risk for the special status or survey and manage plant species found in these units. Although, moist micro-sites may be provided initially, in the long run the drying of fuels at these sites could lead to catastrophic fire that would eliminate populations and any islands of native habitat that may occur.

2) Alternative 2: Proposed Action

The handpiling and burning of handpiles will greatly reduce the threat of catastrophic fire to the special status or survey and manage plants found in these units. It will also help to protect legacy trees/habitat islands from being eliminated by wildfire. Buffers will provide immediate protection to plant populations which are sensitive to fire and ground disturbance as fuel treatments will allow for reduction in fuel loading adjacent to these buffers.

Since piling and the burning of piles will be kept at least ten (10) feet or more from the boles of 16" DBH or greater trees, (all land allocations) any habitat which may exist for lichens and bryophytes will be protected and the potential for non-vascular plants to re-establish in the future will be maintained.

Chapter 3
Agencies and Persons Consulted

A. Public Involvement

No formal public scoping or involvement was held on this proposed project. Extensive discussions about the Resource area's prescribed burning program have been held with Oregon State Department of Forestry.

B. Availability of Document and Comment Procedures

The EA will be available for a 15 day public review period in the BLM Medford District Office, on the Medford District's web site or by request.

Appendix A: Proposed Hazard Reduction Units

TABLE 1: PROPOSED HAZARD REDUCTION UNITS

Previous Silvicultural Treatment	Key #	Legal	Land Allocation	Unit Name	Unit Acres	Ripar. Class (I-IV)	Special Status, S&M Plants	POC Present in Area	POC Disease in Area	Wildlife Seasonal Restrictions	Access via Natural surface roads	5th field Watershed
Brush	114512	34S-05W-33-007	Matrix	Robert's Mt. 5	24	------	------	no	no	no	yes	Jumpoff Joe
Brush	112842	34S-08W-15-024	LSR & RR	W. Rum 15-3	16	IV	------	yes	no	no	no	Far Out
Brush	112764	34S-08W-28-008	LSR & RR	Peggler Butte	16	IV	------	yes	no	no	no	Rogue - Rec.
Brush	112892	34S-08W-29-005	LSR & RR	Galice Complex 29-3	65	II & IV	------	yes	no	no	yes	Rogue - Rec.
Brush	110701 112899	34S-08W-32-001 34S-08W-33-005	LSR & RR	Dead Peg/Fire Fly	76	IV	------	yes	no	no	yes	Rogue - Rec.
Brush	112894	34S-08W-32-005	LSR & RR	Mill Cr.	44	II & IV	------	yes	no	no	yes	Rogue - Rec.
Brush	113096	35S-08W-07-006	LSR	Galice Fire X	12	------	------	yes	no	no	yes	Rogue - Rec.
Brush	111350	35S-09W-01-014	LSR	Silver Spur 2A	22	------	------	yes	yes	no	no	N. Fk. Silver Cr.
Brush	113791	35S-09W-02-017	LSR & RR	Sourgrass 2-3	15	IV	------	yes	yes	no	no	N. Fk. Silver Cr.
Brush	113888	35S-09W-03-012	LSR & RR	Sourgrass 3-7B	50	IV	------	yes	yes	no	yes	N. Fk. Silver Cr.
Brush	113796	35S-09W-03-014	LSR & RR	Sourgrass 3-4B	34	IV	Yes Frazera (buffer required) & LEDA, (buffer not required)	yes	yes	no	yes	N. Fk. Silver Cr.
Brush	113802	35S-09W-13-006	LSR	Galice Fire/ Silver Spur	17	------	------	yes	no	no	yes	Rogue - Rec.
Brush	113808 113811	35S-09W-14-014 35S-09W-15-013	LSR & RR	Silver Spur 18	44	IV	------	yes	yes	no	yes	N. Fk. Silver Cr.
Brush	113139	35S-09W-15-008	LSR	Silver Cat Scarif	15	------	------	yes	yes	no	yes	N. Fk. Silver Cr.
Brush	114926	35S-09W-16-003	LSR & RR	Silver Cr.	32	IV	------	yes	yes	no	yes	N. Fk. Silver Cr.
Brush	113168	36S-07W-27-013	Matrix	Blue Gulch 1-1A	8	------	------	yes	no	no	yes	Rogue - Rec.
Brush	113169	36S-07W-27-014	Matrix	Blue Draper 27-3	9	------	------	yes	no	no	yes	Rogue - Rec.
Brush	113170	36S-07W-27-015	Matrix	Blue Gulch 1-6B	10	------	------	yes	no	no	yes	Rogue - Rec.
Brush	116276	37S-07W-01-004	Matrix	Slate Knight 1-1	6	------	------	no	no	no	yes	Chaney-Slate
Brush	113181	37S-07W-07-008	Matrix & RR	Slate Knight 7-3	8	IV	------	no	no	no	yes	Chaney-Slate
Brush	116261	37S-07W-07-013	Matrix & RR	Slate Knight 7-5B	49	III & IV	------	no	no	no	yes	Chaney-Slate
Brush	116260	37S-07W-07-014	Matrix & RR	Slate Knight 7-6	46	III & IV	------	no	no	no	yes	Chaney-Slate
Brush	115777 115778	38S-06W-25-010 38S-05W-30-007	LSR & RR	Two T's 25-5	36	IV	------	no	no	no	yes	Williams

TABLE 1: PROPOSED HAZARD REDUCTION UNITS

Previous Silvicultural Treatment	Key #	Legal	Land Allocation	Unit Name	Unit Acres	Ripar. Class (I-IV)	Special Status, S&M Plants	POC Present in Area	POC Disease in Area	Wildlife Seasonal Restrictions	Access via Natural surface roads	5th field Watershed
Brush	115786	38S-05W-31-009	LSR, AMA & RR	Two T's 31-5	22	IV	------	no	no	no	yes	Williams
Brush	113322	38S-07W-23-020	Matrix	Dryden Overlook	10	------	------	no	no	no	yes	Deer Cr.
Brush	115773	38S-07W-23-025	Matrix	Dry White 23-1	38	IV	FEEL 2 buffers	no	no	no	yes	Deer Cr.
Brush	113339	38S-07W-31-011	Matrix	Scottish Verbascum 31-2E	12	------	------	no	no	no	no	Deer Cr.
Brush	116519 117003	39S-05W-07-013 39S-06W-12-022	LSR AMA	So. Williams 7-2	12	------	------	yes	yes	no	yes	Deer Cr.
Brush	116186 116185	39S-06W-03-022 39S-06W-04-015	LSR & RR	Wildeer Ridge 3-1	33	III & IV	------	yes	no	no	no	Deer Cr.
Brush	112071	39S-07W-27-001	Matrix & RR	Robinson Hill Rev.	15	IV	------	no	no	no	no	Althouse Cr.
Brush	116255	39S-07W-35-025	Matrix	Robman 35-12	10	IV	------	no	no	no	no	Althouse Cr.
Brush	112576	40S-07W-01-001	Matrix & RR	Golden Sucker 1-1	28	IV	------	yes	yes	no	yes	Sucker Cr.
Brush	112159	40S-07W-01-006	Matrix & RR	Golden Sucker 1-2	37	IV	------	yes	yes	yes Tiger Spring STOC - seasonal restrictions on chainsaw use.	yes	Sucker Cr.
Brush	113576	40S-07W-01-014	Matrix	Mary's Load 1	8	------	------	yes	yes	yes Tiger Spring STOC - seasonal restrictions on chainsaw use.	yes	Sucker Cr.
Brush	116663	40S-07W-01-022	Matrix & RR	Golden Sucker 1-3	21	III & IV	------	yes	yes	yes Tiger Spring STOC - Seasonal restrictions on chainsaw use.	yes	Sucker Cr.
Brush	116664	40S-07W-12-016	Matrix & RR	Golden Sucker 12-1	15	IV	------	yes	no	no	yes	Sucker Cr.
Brush	113892	40S-07W-13-006	Matrix	Mary's Load 10	5	------	------	yes	yes	no	yes	Sucker Cr.
Brush	116667	40S-07W-13-008	Matrix & RR	Golden Sucker 13-3	13	IV	------	yes	yes	no	yes	Sucker Cr.
Brush	115726	40S-08W-09-004	Matrix & RR	Logan Lo-Cal 9-1	29	IV	------	yes	no	no	yes	W. Illinois
Units for PCT												
PCT	114513	34S-05W-33-008	Matrix	Winona	59	------	-------	No	No	no	yes	Jumpoff Joe
PCT	114760	34S-08W-03-014	LSR	Rum Cr. B/O 3-1	18	------	-------	Yes	No	no	yes	Wild Rogue
PCT	115739	34S-08W-10-022	LSR & RR	Rum Cr. B/O 10-4	35	IV	-------	Yes	No	no	no	Wild Rogue
PCT	112847	34S-08W-16-004	LSR & RR	W. Rum Cr. 16-2	31	IV	------	Yes	No	No	no	Wild Rogue

TABLE 1: PROPOSED HAZARD REDUCTION UNITS

Previous Silvicultural Treatment	Key #	Legal	Land Allocation	Unit Name	Unit Acres	Ripar. Class (I-IV)	Special Status, S&M Plants	POC Present in Area	POC Disease in Area	Wildlife Seasonal Restrictions	Access via Natural surface roads	5th field Watershed
PCT	112865	34S-08W-22-009	LSR & RR	Rum Cr. Spur 2	15	IV	------	No	No	No	yes	Rogue - Rec.
PCT	113864	34S-08W-28-015	LSR & RR	Peggler Fir	66	IV	------	Yes	No	No		Rogue - Rec.
PCT	112891	34S-08W-29-004	LSR & RR	Galice Complex 29-5	25	III & IV	------	No	No	No	yes	Rogue - Rec.
PCT	113108 113109	35S-09W-02-016 35S-09W-03-001	LSR & RR	Sourgrass 1	21	IV	Yes LEDA (buffer not needed)	Yes	No	no	yes	N. Fk. Silver
PCT	116423	35S-09W-03-021	LSR & RR	Sourgrass Salvage	11	------	------	Yes	No	No	yes	N. Fk. Silver
PCT	113167	36S-07W-27-012	Matrix	Blue Gulch 1-2/3B	10	------	------	Yes	No	No	yes	Rogue - Rec.
PCT	157884	37S-04W-05-008	Matrix	Birdseye West 5-2	31	------	Yes CYFA, CYMO, & ISST extensive buffering needed.	No	No	No	no	Grants Pass
PCT	115268	37S-07W-07-002	AMA not in LSR & RR	Slate Creek	10	IV	------	No	No	No	yes	Cheney Slate
PCT	114695	37S-07W-15-004	AMA not in LSR	Hot Loft 15-3	7	------	-------	No	No	No	yes	Cheney Slate
PCT	113211	38S-05W-05-012	LSR/AMA & RR	Chrome Dome 5-2	30	III, IV	------	No	No	No	yes	Murphy
PCT	113212	38S-05W-05-013	LSR / AMA	Chrome Dome 5-1A	28	------	------	No	No	No	yes	Murphy
PCT	113214	38S-05W-06-001	LSR/AMA & RR	Chrome Dome 6-1	35	IV	------	No	No	No	yes	Murphy
PCT	113768	38S-05W-07-013	LSR/AMA & RR	Honey Wallow	12	IV	------	No	No	No	yes	Murphy
PCT	113234	38S-05W-19-007	LSR/AMA	Powell Creek Salvage	6	------	------	No	No	No	no	Williams
PCT	111444 116044	38S-06W-13-017 38S-06W-14-030	LSR	Murphy's Wallow 8-B	54	------	------	No	No	No	no	Murphy
PCT	111455	38S-06W-15-002	LSR/AMA	Spencer's Hole 15-1	15	------	------	No	No	No	yes	Murphy
PCT	113266	38S-06W-19-012	LSR	Spring White	10	------	------	Yes	No	No	yes	Williams
PCT	116191	38S-06W-27-012	LSR & RR	Wild eer Ridge 27-6	22	IV off N. line	------	No	No	No	no	Deer
PCT	111579	38S-07W-01-010	LSR	Crooks Creek Cleanup	30	------	-------	No	No	Yes Crooks Deer STOC Seasonal restrictions on chainsaw use.	yes	Deer
PCT	113775	38S-07W-03-010	Matrix & RR	Crooked Cedar 3-3B	30	IV	-------	No	No	Yes Big Cedar STOC Seasonal restrictions on chainsaw use.	no	Deer
PCT	113304	38S-07W-13-007	LSR	Godfather Salvage	7	------	-------	Yes	No	No	no	Deer

TABLE 1: PROPOSED HAZARD REDUCTION UNITS

Previous Silvicultural Treatment	Key #	Legal	Land Allocation	Unit Name	Unit Acres	Ripar. Class (I-IV)	Special Status, S&M Plants	POC Present in Area	POC Disease in Area	Wildlife Seasonal Restrictions	Access via Natural surface roads	5th field Watershed
PCT	113313	38S-07W-22-002	Matrix	Dry White 22-1	29	------	-------	No	No	No	no	Deer Creek
PCT	113337	38S-07W-31-009	Matrix	Scottish Verbas 31-2C	45	III & IV	-------	No	No	No	no	Deer Creek
PCT	113346	38S-07W-35-007	Matrix	N. Frk Thompson Cr. 1	37	III & IV	-------	No	No	No	yes	Deer Creek
PCT	111775	39S-05W-17-003	AMA not in LSR	So. Williams 17 1 A/B	28	------	-------	Yes	Access thru POC infected area Infected area to SW off 39-5-7 rd	Yes Liberty STOC Seasonal restrictions on chainsaw use.	yes	Williams
PCT	116241	39S-05W-23-017	AMA not in LSR & RR	Rocky East Fork 12	10	III	-------	Yes	Access thru POC infected area Infected area to SE off 39-5-23.2 rd	No	yes	Williams
PCT	113405	39S-05W-29-009	LSR/AMA	Rocky East Fork 29-2	12	------	-------	Yes	Access thru POC infected area	No	yes	Williams
PCT	113423	39S-06W-01-008	LSR	Swamp Flat 2	11	------	-------	Yes	Access thru POC infected area Infected area off 39-5-6 rd	No	yes	Williams
PCT	113537	39S-07W-21-007	Matrix	Bear Grapes 21-3B	37	------	-------	No	No	No	no	Sucker Creek
PCT	113538	39S-07W-21-008	Matrix	Bear Grapes 3A/3C	31	------	-------	No	No	No	no	Sucker Creek
PCT	113559	39S-07W-35-018	Matrix	Robman 35-18	32	IV	-------	No	No	Yes Claim Ridge STOC Seasonal restrictions on chainsaw use.	no	Althouse Creek
PCT	114034	40S-07W-01-019	Matrix	Sucker Creek 2	13	------	-------	Yes	Yes	No	yes	Althouse
PCT	113404	39S-05W-28-005	LSR/AMA & RR	Rocky East Fork	24	III -W. side of unit	-------	Yes	Yes	No	no	Williams
PCT	113403 113406	39S-05W-28-004 39S-05W-29-010	LSR/AMA & RR	Rocky East Fork #2	24	III-E. side of unit	-------	Yes	Yes	No	yes	Williams
				TOTAL	**1913**							