

**Port Orford Cedar Risk Key Analysis for the Preferred Alternative (Alt. 5) of the Mr. Wilson Timber Sale**

(Risk Key is from Alternative 2 of the FSEIS for Management of Port Orford Cedar in Southwest Oregon 1/2004)

1/26/04

page 1 of 4

QUESTION		UNIT (operations including harvests, site preparation, ripping of skid trails and reforestation)																			
		1	3A	3C	5B	12	13	16	17A	18	19	20 (a&b)	21	22	24A	25A	28	29A	29B	29C	32
1a.	Are there uninfected POC within, near <sup>1</sup> , or downstream of the activity area whose ecological, Tribal, or product use or function measurably contributes to meeting land and resource management plan objectives?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
1b.	Are there uninfected POC within, near <sup>1</sup> , or downstream of the activity area that, were they to become infected, would likely spread infections to trees whose ecological, Tribal, or product use or function measurable contributes to meeting land and resource management plan objectives?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
1c.	Is the activity area within an uninfested 7 <sup>th</sup> field watershed <sup>2</sup> as defined in Alternative 6	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
		<i>If the answer to all three questions, 1a, 1b, and 1c, is no, then risk is low and no POC management practices would be required.</i>																			
		<i>If the answer to any of the three questions is yes, continue.</i>																			
2.	Will the proposed project introduce appreciable additional risk <sup>3</sup> of infection to these uninfected POC?	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
		<i>If no, then risk is low and no POC management practices are required.</i>																			
		<i>If yes, apply management practices from the list below [within FSEIS] to reduce the risk to the point it is no longer appreciable, or meet the disease control objectives by other means, such as redesigning the project so that uninfected POC are no longer near or downstream of the activity area. If the risk cannot be reduced to the point it is no longer appreciable through practicable and cost-effective treatments or design changes, the project may proceed if the analysis supports a finding that the value or need for the proposed activity outweighs the additional risk to POC created by the project.</i>																			

1 - In questions 1a and 1b, "near" generally means within 25 to 50 feet downslope or 25 feet upslope from management activity areas, access roads, or haul routs; farther for drainage features; 100 to 200 feet in streams.

2 - Uninfested 7th field watersheds are listed on Table A12-2 [of FSEIS] as those with at least 100 acres of POC stands, are at least 50% federal ownership, and are free of PL except within the lowermost 2 acres of the drainage.

3 - Appreciable additional risk does not mean "any risk." It means that a reasonable person would recognize risk, additional to existing uncontrollable risk, to believe mitigation is warranted and would make a cost-effective or important difference (see Risk Key Definitions and Examples for further discussion.)

**Port Orford Cedar Risk Key Analysis for the Preferred Alternative (Alt. 5) of the Mr. Wilson Timber Sale**  
 (Risk Key is from Alternative 2 of the FSEIS for Management of Port Orford Cedar in Southwest Oregon 1/2004)

QUESTION		Roads / Road Systems (operations and use including roadside brushing, renovation, drainage improvement, log hauling, and decommissioning. See Table 2 or Mr. Wilson EA, p. 15)																			
		31-9-34	31-9-35	32-7-2.0	32-8-1.1	21-8-31	32-9-3	32-9-4a	32-9-4b	32-9-4.1	32-9-4.2	32-9-7	32-9-7.1	32-9-7.2	32-9-7.3	32-9-7.4	32-9-8	32-9-8.1	32-9-8.2	32-9-8.3	32-9-8.4
1a.	Are there uninfected POC within, near <sup>1</sup> , or downstream of the activity area whose ecological, Tribal, or product use or function measurably contributes to meeting land and resource management plan objectives?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
1b.	Are there uninfected POC within, near <sup>1</sup> , or downstream of the activity area that, were they to become infected, would likely spread infections to trees whose ecological, Tribal, or product use or function measurable contributes to meeting land and resource management plan objectives?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
1c.	Is the activity area within an uninfested 7 <sup>th</sup> field watershed <sup>2</sup> as defined in Alternative 6	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
<i>If the answer to any of the three questions is yes, continue.</i>		<i>If the answer to all three questions, 1a, 1b, and 1c, is no, then risk is low and no POC management practices would be required.</i>																			
2.	Will the proposed project introduce appreciable additional risk <sup>3</sup> of infection to these uninfected POC?	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
<i>If yes, apply management practices from the list below [within FSEIS] to reduce the risk to the point it is no longer appreciable, or meet the disease control objectives by other means, such as redesigning the project so that uninfected POC are no longer near or downstream of the activity area. If the risk cannot be reduced to the point it is no longer appreciable through practicable and cost-effective treatments or design changes, the project may proceed if the analysis supports a finding that the value or need for the proposed activity outweighs the additional risk to POC created by the project.</i>		<i>If no, then risk is low and no POC management practices are required.</i>																			

1 - In questions 1a and 1b, "near" generally means within 25 to 50 feet downslope or 25 feet upslope from management activity areas, access roads, or haul routs; farther for drainage features; 100 to 200 feet in streams.  
 2 - Uninfested 7th field watersheds are listed on Table A12-2 [ of FSEIS] as those with at least 100 acres of POC stands, are at least 50% federal ownership, and are free of PL except within the lowermost 2 acres of the drainage.  
 3 - Appreciable additional risk does not mean "any risk." It means that a reasonable person would recognize risk, additional to existing uncontrollable risk, to believe mitigation is warranted and would make a cost-effective or important difference (see Risk Key Definitions and Examples for further discussion.)

**Port Orford Cedar Risk Key Analysis for the Preferred Alternative (Alt. 5) of the Mr. Wilson Timber Sale**  
 (Risk Key is from Alternative 2 of the FSEIS for Management of Port Orford Cedar in Southwest Oregon 1/2004)

QUESTION		Roads / Road Systems															
		32-9-10	32-9-15	32-9-16.1	32-9-16.2	32-9-17	Primitive Rd 18	Primitive Rd 29									
1a.	Are there uninfected POC within, near <sup>1</sup> , or downstream of the activity area whose ecological, Tribal, or product use or function measurably contributes to meeting land and resource management plan objectives?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No									
1b.	Are there uninfected POC within, near <sup>1</sup> , or downstream of the activity area that, were they to become infected, would likely spread infections to trees whose ecological, Tribal, or product use or function measurable contributes to meeting land and resource management plan objectives?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No									
1c.	Is the activity area within an uninfested 7 <sup>th</sup> field watershed <sup>2</sup> as defined in Alternative 6	No	No	No	No	No	No	No									
<i>If the answer to any of the three questions is yes, continue.</i>		<i>If the answer to all three questions, 1a, 1b, and 1c, is no, then risk is low and no POC management practices would be required.</i>															
2.	Will the proposed project introduce appreciable additional risk <sup>3</sup> of infection to these uninfected POC?	---	---	---	---	---	---	---									
<i>If yes, apply management practices from the list below [within FSEIS] to reduce the risk to the point it is no longer appreciable, or meet the disease control objectives by other means, such as redesigning the project so that uninfected POC are no longer near or downstream of the activity area. If the risk cannot be reduced to the point it is no longer appreciable through practicable and cost-effective treatments or design changes, the project may proceed if the analysis supports a finding that the value or need for the proposed activity outweighs the additional risk to POC created by the project.</i>		<i>If no, then risk is low and no POC management practices are required.</i>															

1 - In questions 1a and 1b, "near" generally means within 25 to 50 feet downslope or 25 feet upslope from management activity areas, access roads, or haul routs; farther for drainage features; 100 to 200 feet in streams.  
 2 - Uninfested 7th field watersheds are listed on Table A12-2 [of FSEIS] as those with at least 100 acres of POC stands, are at least 50% federal ownership, and are free of PL except within the lowermost 2 acres of the drainage.  
 3 - Appreciable additional risk does not mean "any risk." It means that a reasonable person would recognize risk, additional to existing uncontrollable risk, to believe mitigation is warranted and would make a cost-effective or important difference (see Risk Key Definitions and Examples for further discussion.)

**Port Orford Cedar Risk Key Analysis for the Preferred Alternative (Alt. 5) of the Mr. Wilson Timber Sale**  
 (Risk Key is from Alternative 2 of the FSEIS for Management of Port Orford Cedar in Southwest Oregon 1/2004)

QUESTION	Other Project Associated Actions													
	Helipad 32-9-5	Helipad 32-9-7	Helipad 32-9-9	Plant RR adjacent to unit #13	Restoration of excavated landings									
1a. Are there uninfected POC within, near <sup>1</sup> , or downstream of the activity area whose ecological, Tribal, or product use or function measurably contributes to meeting land and resource management plan objectives?	No	No	No	No	No									
1b. Are there uninfected POC within, near <sup>1</sup> , or downstream of the activity area that, were they to become infected, would likely spread infections to trees whose ecological, Tribal, or product use or function measurable contributes to meeting land and resource management plan objectives?	No	No	No	No	No									
1c. Is the activity area within an uninfested 7 <sup>th</sup> field watershed <sup>2</sup> as defined in Alternative 6	No	No	No	No	No									
<i>If the answer to all three questions, 1a, 1b, and 1c, is no, then risk is low and no POC management practices would be required.</i>														
<i>If the answer to any of the three questions is yes, continue.</i>														
2. Will the proposed project introduce appreciable additional risk <sup>3</sup> of infection to these uninfested POC?	---	---	---	---	---	---	---							
<i>If no, then risk is low and no POC management practices are required.</i>														
<i>If yes, apply management practices from the list below [within FSEIS] to reduce the risk to the point it is no longer appreciable, or meet the disease control objectives by other means, such as redesigning the project so that uninfested POC are no longer near or downstream of the activity area. If the risk cannot be reduced to the point it is no longer appreciable through practicable and cost-effective treatments or design changes, the project may proceed if the analysis supports a finding that the value or need for the proposed activity outweighs the additional risk to POC created by the project.</i>														

1 - In questions 1a and 1b, "near" generally means within 25 to 50 feet downslope or 25 feet upslope from management activity areas, access roads, or haul routs; farther for drainage features; 100 to 200 feet in streams.  
 2 - Uninfested 7th field watersheds are listed on Table A12-2 [of FSEIS] as those with at least 100 acres of POC stands, are at least 50% federal ownership, and are free of PL except within the lowermost 2 acres of the drainage.  
 3 - Appreciable additional risk does not mean "any risk." It means that a reasonable person would recognize risk, additional to existing uncontrollable risk, to believe mitigation is warranted and would make a cost-effective or important difference (see Risk Key Definitions and Examples for further discussion.)