

FIR GULCH/COLEMAN  
CREEK FUELS REDUCTION  
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

OR-025-03-010

Bureau of Land Management  
Burns District Office  
28910 Hwy 20 West  
Hines, Oregon 97738

August 2003

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I. Introduction.....	1
A.    Purpose and Need .....	2
B.    Conformance with Applicable Land use Plans.....	2
Chapter II. Alternatives Including the Proposed Action.....	2
A.    Proposed Action.....	2
1.    Within the Stands.....	3
2.    Outside or Perimeter of Stands .....	3
B.    Alternative #2 - No Action .....	4
Chapter III. Affected Environment.....	4
A.    Critical Elements.....	4
1.    Air Quality .....	4
2.    Water Quality (Drinking/Ground Water).....	5
3.    Wetlands and Riparian.....	5
4.    Migratory Birds.....	5
5.    Special Status Species (Fauna) .....	5
6.    Noxious Weeds .....	6
7.    Cultural Heritage.....	6
B.    Noncritical Elements.....	6
1.    Soils.....	6
2.    Vegetation.....	6
3.    Wildlife .....	6
4.    Rangeland Management.....	7
5.    Recreation .....	7
6.    Visual Resource Management .....	7
7.    Economic and Social.....	7
8.    Fire Management .....	7
9.    Forestry .....	8

Chapter IV. Environmental Consequences .....	8
A. Proposed Action: Critical Elements .....	8
1. Air Quality .....	8
2. Water Quality .....	8
3. Wetlands and Riparian .....	8
4. Migratory Birds .....	9
5. Special Status Species (Fauna) .....	9
6. Noxious Weeds .....	9
7. Cultural Heritage .....	9
B. Proposed Action: Noncritical Elements .....	9
1. Soils .....	9
2. Vegetation .....	10
3. Wildlife .....	10
4. Rangeland Management .....	10
5. Recreation .....	10
6. Visual Resource Management .....	10
7. Economic and Social .....	10
8. Fire Management .....	11
9. Forestry .....	11
C. Proposed Action: Cumulative Effects .....	11
D. No Action Alternative: Critical Elements .....	11
1. Air Quality .....	11
2. Water Quality .....	11
3. Wetlands and Riparian .....	12
4. Migratory Birds .....	12
5. Special Status Species (Fauna) .....	12
6. Noxious Weeds .....	12
7. Cultural Heritage .....	12

E.	No Action Alternative: Noncritical Elements.....	13
1.	Soils.....	13
2.	Vegetation.....	13
3.	Wildlife.....	13
4.	Rangeland Management.....	13
5.	Recreation.....	13
6.	Visual Resource Management.....	13
7.	Economic and Social.....	14
8.	Fire Management.....	14
9.	Forestry.....	14
F.	No Action Alternative: Cumulative Effects.....	14
Chapter V. Consultation and Coordination.....		14
A.	Agencies and Individuals Consulted.....	14
B.	Participating BLM Employees.....	15

## CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

The Burns District Bureau of Land Management (BLM) proposes to implement forest management activities in the Three Rivers Resource Area. The areas to be covered by this Environmental Assessment (EA) are Fir Gulch (T. 24 S., R. 35 E., Section 18, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ , elevation 5,200 feet) and Coleman Creek (T. 23 S., R 35 E., Section 34, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , elevation 5,260 feet). Fir Gulch and Coleman Creek are located in the Stinkingwater Mountains, approximately 30 miles east of Burns. Fir Gulch and Coleman Creek have isolated populations of Douglas fir, 40 and 3 acres in size, respectively. The nearest populations of Douglas fir are about 25 miles to the north. There are three predominant age classes within the stands: large (30 to 50+ inches) estimated 250 to 350-year old trees, closed canopy (18 to 30 inches) trees of approximately 80 to 100 years, and small (2 to 10 inches) trees of less than 50 years. The largest tree in the stands, which is in the Fir Gulch stand, is 69+ inches and over 350 years of age.

Six to fourteen-inch diameter Western junipers are common throughout the stands. In the closed canopy areas the junipers are dead and contributing to the high fuel loading. The duff is at least 12 inches deep under the largest trees and contains numerous small branches. Overall the fuel loading is heavy, primarily from the ground fuels and junipers. With all of the different age classes and the large number of interspersed junipers, ladder fuels are a critical concern. There is evidence of past fires in the form of old fire scars present on several of the larger trees. The historic fire regime is estimated to be 20 to 40 years based on anecdotal evidence observed in the series of fire scars on some of the larger trees within the stands (personal observation of Jon Reponen, Forestry Specialist). It has been 80+ years since the last fire, at least twice the estimated historic fire regime, and fuel loading is at the point that a stand replacing fire is likely. A stand replacement fire would kill at least 90 percent of the vegetation, leaving the earth scorched and black. A stand replacement fire could also entirely remove the Douglas fir from this vegetative community. Fire has not been in the stands for approximately 80+ years, roughly the age of the medium size trees in the stands. In addition, areas with junipers outside of the stands have been cut and thus have created a path for fire to enter the stands from the outside.

These are unique and valuable areas of small isolated conifer communities, which warrant some proactive management. These conifers are on the perimeter of their range and are surrounded by riparian, western juniper, mountain mahogany, quaking aspen, and sagebrush/grassland vegetation communities, and, therefore, have high wildlife values due to the habitat diversity created by the juxtaposition of these communities. There are northern goshawk nests at each of the sites. Redband trout are present in an unnamed tributary of Alder Creek that flows through the Fir Gulch project area. There is also a turkey vulture roost in the Fir Gulch stand. Mule deer, elk, and many migratory birds use these areas as well.

A. Purpose and Need

The purpose of this proposal is to:

- Reduce surface fuel loading
- Reduce overstocked Douglas fir stands to improve forest health by increasing the growth and vigor of retained trees.
- Reduce the risk of stand replacement fires.
- Protect unique areas of high resource value from catastrophic wildfires, insects, and disease.
- Improve wildlife habitat for migratory birds and large mammals.

This project is being proposed for the following reasons:

- Overstocked stands are resulting in a decrease in forest health by increasing competition for water, nutrients, sunlight, and increasing the susceptibility to diseases and pathogens.
- Duff and other surface fuels are so abundant that it is likely that a ground fire would cook the roots of the medium and large trees, thus ending up being a stand replacement fire.
- Juniper cuts adjacent to these stands have increased the risk of fire entering these stands.
- Due to the absence of fire and abundance of dead or dying junipers within the stand, ladder fuels have become a critical concern by increasing the risk of a stand replacement fire.
- The overstocked stands pose an increased risk of insect infestation and disease to the areas larger trees.
- The project areas are unique, have high resource value, and are currently at risk of being lost.

B. Conformance with Applicable Land Use Plans

This EA is in compliance with management direction established in the Record of Decision for the Three Rivers Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement (RMP/FEIS) (Chapter 2, Wildlife Habitat, September 1992). The EA is also in compliance with State, tribal, and local laws, regulations, and land use plans.

CHAPTER II. ALTERNATIVES INCLUDING THE PROPOSED ACTION

A. Proposed Action

A combination of thinning, raking duff, fuel piling, and burning would take place to reduce fuels and lessen the risk of losing the stands during a late summer wildfire.

All actions would take place between August 1 and April 1 to minimize goshawk disturbance. The risk of noxious weed introduction would be minimized by ensuring all equipment (including 4-wheelers and pickup trucks) is cleaned prior to entry to the site, minimizing disturbance activities, and follow-up monitoring, for at least 2 years, to ensure no new noxious weed establishment. Should noxious weeds be found, appropriate control treatments will be performed. Cultural heritage sites would be avoided. Depending on funding, on-the-ground actions, excluding burning, would take place over an estimated 3-year period.

1. Within the Stands

Ground fuels (slash and duff) within 10 feet of medium size Douglas fir (18 to 30 inches) and within 20 feet of larger Douglas fir (30+ inches) would be gathered, raked, and piled. This would preferably be done with hand tools but some use of chain saw may be necessary. Douglas fir less than 10 inches Diameter Breast Height (DBH) would be thinned for a 30-foot spacing outside goshawk core stands (Unit A on attached maps). The goshawk core stands are the areas within an one-eighth mile from existing goshawk nests. Douglas fir less than 6 inches DBH would be thinned for a 30-foot spacing in goshawk core stands (Units B and C as shown on map attachments). Thinned Douglas fir would be limbed, bucked, and piled. All dead and live juniper trees with a DBH of less than 18 inches would be cut, limbed, bucked, and piled. All dead and live junipers more than 18 inches DBH that are not providing cavity-nesting habitat would be cut, limbed, and piled, leaving the bole to serve as down woody debris. All juniper and other dead slash less than 18 inches DBH that is already on the ground would be piled. One medium size Douglas fir per acre would be cut and one medium size Douglas fir per acre would be girdled throughout the stand (Units A and B as shown on map attachments). This would be done by BLM employees to ensure the correct trees are cut and girdled. The medium size cut trees would be left on the ground to serve as down woody debris habitat, while the girdled trees would provide snag habitat. All piles would be constructed at least 10 feet away from any medium size Douglas fir, and at least 20 feet away from any larger Douglas fir, junipers providing cavity-nesting habitat, snags or large down woody debris(18+ inches). This would provide a large enough buffer to protect the roots of the trees and prevent the fire from igniting the snag or large down woody debris. Pile construction would also not occur within any riparian vegetation or intermittent parts of the stream. All piles would be burned during the fall.

2. Outside or Perimeter of Stands

Treatments would consist of burning the existing cut junipers within 200 feet of the project areas (Unit D as shown on map attachment). This would reduce the combustible fuels outside of the stands created by the past juniper cutting projects.

B. Alternative #2 - No Action

Under the no action alternative, the BLM would not conduct any forest management activities or fuel reduction treatments in these project areas.

### CHAPTER III. AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

A general description of the existing environment for the area can be found in the Three Rivers RMP/FEIS. The terrain in the Fir Gulch project area is generally of northwest and southeast aspects with slopes ranging from 0 to 40 percent. The terrain in the Coleman Creek project area is generally of north and east aspects with slopes ranging from 0 to 70 percent. Both project areas are in the 5,200 to 5,300 feet elevation ranges.

The following critical elements of the human environment have been analyzed in the Three Rivers RMP/FEIS, and are not known to be present in the project area or affected by enacting either alternative: Wilderness, Wilderness Study Areas, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, Wild and Scenic Rivers, Special Status Flora, American Indian Religious Concerns, Paleontology, Floodplains, Prime or Unique Farmlands, and Hazardous Materials. The following two critical elements are not discussed in the Three Rivers RMP/FEIS:

Adverse Energy Impacts: No known adverse impacts would occur to energy development, production or distribution as a result of the proposed action or alternatives.

Environmental Justice: There are no economically disadvantaged or minority populations present within the project area.

The following critical elements are present and will be analyzed in the document: air quality, water quality, wetlands and riparian, migratory birds, Special Status species (fauna), noxious weeds, and cultural heritage. Noncritical elements which are present and will be analyzed in this document are: soils, vegetation, wildlife, rangeland management, recreation, visual resources, socioeconomics, and fire management.

This section describes site-specific affected environmental components not adequately described in the Three Rivers RMP/FEIS. The discussion is divided into critical and noncritical elements.

A. Critical Elements

1. Air Quality

The air quality currently meets or exceeds air quality standards outlined by the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ). Due to the long distance from large metropolitan areas and factories, ambient air quality is generally good with few particulates or other pollutants.

2. Water Quality (Drinking/Ground Water)

The project areas are located at the uppermost parts of the Alder Creek and Coleman Creek watersheds. Within the project areas water generally flows in response to snowmelt and precipitation events. At other times of the year the streams are intermittent. Water quality has not been tested. Water resources are not used for human consumption.

3. Wetlands and Riparian

The unnamed intermittent tributary to Alder Creek has the only known riparian zone in the proposed project areas. Narrow valley shape and moderate gradient restrict lateral channel migration and limit the size of potential riparian zones.

4. Migratory Birds

Migratory birds are known to use the project areas for nesting, foraging, and resting. Several songbirds as well as a few raptors are known to use the project areas. Five and two raptor nests have been observed in the Fir Gulch and Coleman Creek stands, respectively. There were both goshawk and red-tail nests observed. Most nests were observed in the medium to larger size trees. Fir Gulch has a turkey vulture roost located in it. Snags and down woody debris are scarce in both project areas.

5. Special Status Species (Fauna)

There are no known Federally listed Threatened or Endangered wildlife species in the general area. There are two species found within the project areas that have increased monitoring due to population concerns (Special Status Species). These species are the northern goshawk (*Accipiter gentilis*) and redband trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). In July of 2002 and June of 2003, inventories for northern goshawks were conducted in the project areas. Northern goshawks were found to be present in both the Fir Gulch and Coleman Creek project areas both years.

Redband trout are known to inhabit the unnamed tributary to Alder Creek that flows through Fir Gulch. They use residual pools and areas of intermittent flow as summer habitat. Woody debris from the Douglas fir stand has contributed to the stability of the stream channel and complexity of the aquatic habitat. Redband trout also reside in Coleman Creek downstream of the project area.

6. Noxious Weeds

Both project areas had botanical clearances conducted in 2002. Only minor occurrences of bull thistle (*Cirsium vulgare*) were noted. However, in the general Stinkingwater Mountains area larger infestations of medusahead rye as well as some Scotch thistle and white-top are present.

7. Cultural Heritage

Cultural resource sites are common in the Stinkingwater Mountains upland environments. The most common site types include prehistoric surface lithic scatters and historic trash scatters. Cultural resource surveys have been completed in both of the project areas. Three new cultural resource sites, two lithic scatters, and one National Register ineligible historic homestead were recorded within or adjacent to the Fir Gulch unit. One prehistoric lithic scatter was recorded in the Coleman Creek unit.

B. Noncritical Elements

1. Soils

Soils in the project areas are generally Merlin-Observation-Lambring. These soils are well-drained cobbly or stony loams. The soils range in depth from 10 to 40 inches. Water and wind erosion potential is generally low for these soil types.

2. Vegetation

The vegetation in both Fir Gulch and Coleman Creek consists of Douglas fir old growth with limited understory surrounded by remnant aspen and encroaching juniper. The limited understory is made up of chokecherry, bitter cherry, several forbs, and grasses. The Douglas fir stands are being overstocked with reproduction as fire has been absent from the stand for a number of years. The understory is being choked out by the overstocked reproduction fir and encroaching juniper.

3. Wildlife

The proposed project areas are within both mule deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*) and Rocky Mountain elk (*Cervus elaphus*) summer range. Depending on the climate for the given year, the project areas can provide year-round habitat for these species. The project areas offer small unique islands of coniferous forest surrounded by vast juniper-sagebrush steppe communities. These coniferous islands provide great elusive and thermal cover for many species that inhabit juniper-sagebrush steppe communities. In addition, they provide unique opportunities for species that prefer a coniferous forest habitat.

4. Rangeland Management

Both project areas lie within the Alder Creek Allotment (#5536). The Fir Gulch project area lies within the Alder Creek Pasture. This pasture is grazed every other year from May 1 through June 20. The Coleman Creek Pasture encompasses the Coleman Creek project area. This pasture is grazed every other year, on years when Alder Creek Pasture is rested from livestock grazing, during a period of May 1 through June 30.

5. Recreation

The primary recreation activities in the project areas are associated with hunting big game species such as mule deer, Rocky Mountain elk, and pronghorn antelope. Other recreation activities are associated with hiking and wildlife viewing.

6. Visual Resource Management

The project areas fall entirely within the Visual Resource Management (VRM) Class IV. Management direction from the Three Rivers RMP allows modification of the landscape character. The project areas are remote and are not visible from any highway or main road.

7. Economic and Social

Ranching and lumber industries are the primary sources of employment in eastern Oregon communities. Forest management programs on public and private lands have a long-term, stabilizing influence on local employment and standards of living.

8. Fire Management

The project areas are located in the northern end of the Great Basin. The great Basin is characterized by summer thunderstorms which result in wildfires. The management practices of fire suppression and juniper cutting have resulted in excessive fuel loading within and surrounding the project areas. With fire being absent for 80+ years, at least twice the estimated historic fire regime, in the project areas, the stands are overstocked and have both excessive ladder and ground fuels. This, in conjunction with the juniper cuttings adjacent to the stands, has greatly increased the risk of stand replacement type fires.

9. Forestry

Currently forest health is good in both the Fir Gulch and Coleman Creek stands. However, forest health is declining in both of these stands as overstocking continues to increase competition for water, nutrients, sunlight, and increase the stands' susceptibility to diseases, pathogens, and defoliators. Currently growth rates are generally good with localized pockets of dense slow growing trees, but growth rates have decreased and continue to decrease. Currently there is minimal evidence of beetles or defoliators. There is no evidence of disease with the exception of dwarf mistletoe in some trees near the draw bottom of Fir Gulch. At both sites the duff is very deep under the larger trees and contains numerous small branches. In addition, with all of the different age classes and large number of interspersed junipers, ladder fuels are of critical concern.

#### CHAPTER IV. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

A. Proposed Action: Critical Elements

1. Air Quality

The proposed project would have minimal impacts on air quality. Burning the slash piles would temporarily reduce air quality in the immediate area for a few days until the gases and particulates dissipate.

2. Water Quality

Under the proposed action current water quality conditions would be maintained. Reduction of the duff and understory canopy would reduce interception and transpiration, allowing more water to enter the soil and moving down-slope to stream channels. Any increase in sediments would be minimal due to topography, soils, and project design. The proposed action would reduce the chances of a stand replacement fire thus ensuring stable upslope soil conditions and healthy riparian zones that would contribute to high water quality.

3. Wetlands and Riparian

Under the proposed action current riparian conditions would be maintained because piles would not be constructed in riparian areas. The proposed action would reduce the chances of a stand replacement fire thus limiting the threat of fire damage to the riparian vegetation.

4. Migratory Birds

Direct impacts to migratory birds would be minimized by total avoidance of the project areas during nesting and fledging seasons. Snag and decadent wood availability would increase. In the long term as the trees get larger, migratory birds such as cavity nesters that prefer large trees would have improved habitat quality. Species which utilize deciduous shrub habitat would benefit with the regeneration of chokecherry, bitter cherry, and aspen. There would be a reduction in habitat quality for birds that prefer nesting in dense understories and those that forage in the young understory fir trees.

5. Special Status Species (Fauna)

Under the proposed action northern goshawk habitat would either be maintained or enhanced. Goshawk habitat is likely to persist in the event of a wildfire. Goshawk prey populations are likely to increase as the proposed action is likely to attract more songbirds to the area. Direct effects on goshawks would be minimal as nesting and fledging seasons would be avoided.

The proposed action would not impact redband trout in the short term because piling and burning would not take place in stream channels or riparian areas. The proposed action would reduce the chances of a stand replacement fire thus ensuring stable upslope soil conditions and a continual supply of large woody debris to the stream channel to maintain diverse and complex fish habitat.

6. Noxious Weeds

There would be minimal increases in the risk of introduction of new weed populations or the expansion of existing weed populations as a result of implementing the proposed action. Monitoring for noxious weeds would occur and any weeds attempting to establish a population would be treated.

7. Cultural Heritage

The proposed action would have no known impacts on cultural heritage as the recorded sites from Fir Gulch and Coleman Creek would be avoided.

B. Proposed Action: Noncritical Elements

1. Soils

Minor increases in soil erosion could occur the first couple of years after the project is implemented from the removal of duff around the larger fir trees and pile burning. Soil erosion would likely decrease thereafter as understory vegetation regenerates.

2. Vegetation

Under this alternative existing vegetation would likely be enhanced. The vegetation within the project areas would be better apt to deal with wildfire as conditions would be reestablished to that of a stand existing within its historical fire regime. Understory forbs, grasses, and shrubs would likely reestablish. Forest health and vigor of the fir stand would be enhanced.

3. Wildlife

Under the proposed action wildlife habitat would be maintained. The fir stands would likely persist even in the event of a catastrophic wildfire. The stands would continue to provide excellent hiding and thermal cover. Foraging opportunities for big game and other herbivores would increase as understory grasses, forbs, and shrubs reestablish.

4. Rangeland Management

There would be no known adverse impacts to rangeland management activities. Some increased forage and improved palatability would result from the proposed treatments.

5. Recreation

The project areas have low to moderate hunting pressure. The proposed project could disturb hunting in the immediate area if treatments overlap a deer or elk hunting season, however, there are many opportunities to hunt big game throughout the Stinkingwater Mountains.

6. Visual Resource Management

The proposed action meets the objectives of this VRM class. Visual resources would be temporarily affected while treatments are taking place. Upon completion of the project visual resources should be enhanced as the regeneration of deciduous shrubs and trees take place.

7. Economic and Social

There could be positive impacts to local economies as most of the work would be contracted out. There could also be minor positive impacts to local merchants as supplies to implement the project are purchased.

8. Fire Management

All treatments included in the proposed action would reduce fuel loading and help lessen the negative effects of wildfire. The removal of juniper within stand and the thinning of fir under 10 inches outside the goshawk core stand and under 6 inches within the goshawk core stand should reduce the ladder fuels sufficiently to avoid a crown fire destroying the stand. The removal of ground fuels around the larger trees (18+ inches) should eliminate the risk of losing these trees in the event of a ground fire. Proposed fuel treatments outside the stands on the existing juniper cuts would reduce the excessive fuel loading which would help to prevent a catastrophic wildfire from occurring within these stands. Overall the risk of a stand replacing fire occurring in the stands would be greatly reduced.

9. Forestry

Under the proposed action forest health would be enhanced. Growth and vigor of the stands' trees would be enhanced. The risk of disease and insect infestations entering and/or spreading through the stand would decrease as growth and vigor of the stand increases. The risk of a stand replacement wildfire occurring in the stands would be greatly reduced.

C. Proposed Action: Cumulative Effects

There would be no known cumulative effects as a result of implementing the proposed action.

D. No Action Alternative: Critical Elements

1. Air Quality

This alternative would cause no change to air quality due to human activity. However, large quantities of particulates and gases would be released into the air in the event of a large wildfire.

2. Water Quality

This alternative would not impact water quality conditions unless a wildfire burns through the Douglas fir stands. If the Douglas fir stands burn there would be a reduction in canopy cover over the stream and there could be excess sediment delivered to the stream. An excessive sediment load could be detrimental to water quality, and a reduction in canopy cover could result in an increase in water temperature.

3. Wetlands and Riparian

This alternative would not impact riparian zones unless a wildfire burns through the Douglas fir stand. If the Douglas fir stand burns it is likely that the riparian vegetation would burn as well. A burn through the stand could result in an excess of sediment delivered to the riparian zone. An excessive sediment load could be detrimental to riparian vegetation and functionality.

4. Migratory Birds

There would be no disturbance of migratory birds due to human activity. A reduction of habitat quality would occur for species utilizing more open stands with a healthy understory. The stand would continue to lack snag and down woody debris habitat, thus limiting the number of woodpeckers and cavity nesters. Habitat would be improved for a few species which forage and nest in habitats with dense stand characteristics. Impacts on most migratory bird habitat would be devastating if a catastrophic wildfire burned through the project areas.

5. Special Status Species (Fauna)

This alternative would not affect the northern goshawks, or the habitat they use in these areas unless a wildfire burns through the area. A catastrophic wildfire would have devastating effects on their habitat.

This alternative would not impact redband trout unless a wildfire burns through the Douglas fir stand. If the Douglas fir stand burns there could be excess sediment delivered to the stream and a reduction in riparian vegetation leading to increased water temperatures. An excessive sediment load and increased water temperatures could be detrimental to redband trout.

6. Noxious Weeds

There would be no change in the risk of introduction of new weed populations or the expansion of existing weed populations due to human activity. The risk of noxious weed invasion would be high if a large wildfire swept through the area.

7. Cultural Heritage

There would be no immediate impacts to cultural resources. This alternative would permit continued existing and increasing fuel loads. The natural or human-caused, untimely, and uncontrolled ignition of those fuels and the subsequent suppression effort could have many different and broadly devastating effects on cultural resource properties.

E. No Action Alternative: Noncritical Elements

1. Soils

Under the no action alternative, no additional soil compaction, disturbance or erosion would occur from human activity. The risk of soil damage and heavy erosion following a catastrophic wildfire would increase.

2. Vegetation

The no action alternative would likely limit the ability of the fir stands to survive wildfire. Forest health and vigor would continue to decrease as stocking levels continue to increase. It is likely that the reestablishment of understory grasses, forbs, and shrubs would not occur.

3. Wildlife

There would be no disturbance to wildlife due to human activities. Habitat quality for species which prefer dense stand characteristics would increase with time providing a catastrophic wildfire did not occur. Thermal and hiding cover would continue to be excellent providing a wildfire does not occur. Habitat quality for species which prefer greater herbaceous cover and more open fir stands would decrease. Species which utilize large diameter trees would be negatively impacted as the vigor and rate of growth of large trees continue to decrease due to overstocking.

4. Rangeland Management

There would be no impacts to rangeland management activities under this alternative.

5. Recreation

There would be no impacts to any ongoing recreational activities under this alternative.

6. Visual Resource Management

The project areas' visual character would not be affected under this alternative; it could be changed drastically if a major wildfire event occurred. These unique fir stands provide a visual resource that would be at risk of being lost during a catastrophic wildfire.

7. Economic and Social

There would be no change to social and economic aspects of this area under this alternative.

8. Fire Management

Under this alternative no fuels treatments would occur. The existing threat of a stand replacing wildfire would continue. Eventually a wildfire will occur, burning the stand and surrounding areas. A wildfire in these stands during fire season with the existing fuel loading would have a high probability of totally destroying these stands.

9. Forestry

Implementation of the no action alternative would likely cause forest health to slowly decrease. Growth rates and vigor would decrease as more and more trees compete for available resources. The risk of disease and insect infestations would likely increase as the general forest health decreases. The risk of a stand replacing fire would remain high and increase with time.

F. No Action Alternative: Cumulative Effects

There would be no known cumulative effects as a result of implementing the no action alternative unless a stand replacement wildfire burns through either or both of the Douglas fir stands. Fir Gulch and Coleman Creek are the only Douglas fir stands in the Stinkingwater Mountains, thus if wildfire takes out these stands Douglas fir communities will be absent in the Stinkingwater Mountains.

Fir Gulch and Coleman Creek are also the only known nest sites for goshawks in the Stinkingwater Mountains. If these nest sites are lost to a catastrophic wildfire goshawks could be absent from the Stinkingwater Mountains.

CHAPTER V. CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

A. Agencies and Individuals Consulted

Burns Paiute Tribe  
Harney County Court  
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife  
U.S. Forest Service: Malheur National Forest, Emigrant Creek Ranger District

B. Participating BLM Employees

Bill Andersen, Rangeland Management Specialist  
Jim Buchanan, Supervisory Natural Resource Specialist  
Angie Foster, Fuels Planner  
Gary Foulkes, District Planning/Environmental Coordinator  
Doug Linn, Botanist  
Fred McDonald, Natural Resource Specialist-Recreation  
Nick Miller, Wildlife Biologist, Lead Preparer  
Lance Okeson, Fuels Planner  
Skip Renschler, Realty Specialist  
Jon Reponen, Forestry Specialist  
Lesley Richman, Weed Specialist  
Jeff Rose, Fire Ecologist  
Joan Suther, Resource Area Manager  
Fred Taylor, Wildlife Biologist  
Scott Thomas, Archaeologist  
Laurie Thompson, Fire Archaeologist  
Cindy Weston, Fisheries Biologist  
Michael Weston, Fisheries Biologist