

Wahl Tract Amendment to Reciprocal Right-of-Way Agreement R-767

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)

The Swiftwater Field Office, Roseburg District, Bureau of Land Management, has analyzed a proposal called the **Wahl Tract Amendment to Reciprocal Right-of-Way Agreement R-767**. In the proposed action, regeneration harvest of mature and old growth timber would occur in the Lower North Umpqua Watershed located in Sections 27 and 29; T25S R5W; W.M.

The Environmental Assessment (EA), OR-104-01-07, contains a description and analysis of the proposed action. A summary of the analysis contained in the EA shows:

- 1). Approximately three acres were analyzed for potential harvest activity which represents less than 0.003 % of the 106,190 acre Lower Umpqua fifth-field watershed and less than 0.07 % of the 2905 acre Cooper Creek watershed landbase.
- 2). The project would not be expected to impact any special status plants (EA, page 7) or cultural resources (EA, page 7).
- 3). Informal consultation with the US Fish & Wildlife Service has been completed. A Letter of Concurrence was received on July 2, 2001 concluded that the action is ". . . not likely to adversely affect spotted owls. Incidental take is not expected with the action as described for this consultation".
- 4). Formal consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service was not required. The Swiftwater Fisheries Biologist has determined this action to be a "no effect" for the Oregon Coast coho salmon and the Oregon Coast steelhead trout or their designated critical habitat.

This proposal is in conformance with the *"Final - Roseburg District Proposed Resource Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/EIS) dated October 1994 and its associated Roseburg District Record of Decision and Resources Management Plan (RMP) dated June 2, 1995*. This proposal is located on lands within the Matrix Land Use Allocation. The RMP permits ". . . timber harvest and other silvicultural activities in that portion of the matrix with suitable forest lands, according to management actions/directions . . ." (RMP, pg. 33). Two alternatives were analyzed: the no action and proposed action alternatives.

Finding of No Significant Impacts: I have reviewed the tests of significance as described in 40 CFR 1508.27 (see attached). Based on the site specific analysis summarized in the EA and noted above, it is my determination that the proposed action does not constitute a major federal action with significant impacts to the quality of the human environment therefore an Environmental Impact Statement does not need to be prepared. I further find that the proposed activity is consistent with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy objectives and meets or does not prevent attainment of these objectives.

Jay K. Carlson
Swiftwater Field Manager

Date

Test for Significant Impacts. (516 DM 2 Appendix 2)

1. Has impacts (both beneficial and adverse) determined to be severe? Yes No

Remarks: None of the impacts of this action has been determined to be severe.

2. Has significant adverse impacts on public health or safety? Yes No

Remarks: Considering the limited area of the project and the design features governing the proposal, the likelihood of the project affecting public health and safety is remote and speculative.

3. Adversely effects such unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources, park, recreation or refuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers, sole or principal drinking water aquifers, prime farmlands, wetlands, floodplains or ecologically significant or critical areas including those listed on the Department's National Register of Natural Landmarks? Yes No

Remarks: Reviews (Cultural, Recreation, Wildlife, Hydrology and Fisheries) does not show that the proposed action would affect any of the above characteristics (EA, pg. 9).

4. Has highly controversial effects on the quality of the human environment?

Yes No

Remarks: Public responses received during the public comment period expressed a desire for the “no action “ alternative but we find that this degree of controversy does not satisfy the threshold for the preparation of an EIS.

5. Has highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involves unique or unknown environmental risks? Yes No

Remarks: The analysis does not indicate that this action would involve unique or unknown risks.

6. Establishes a precedent for future action or represents a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects? Yes No

Remarks: The award of a timber sale contract allowing the harvest of trees is a well-established practice and does not establish a precedent for future actions.

7. Is directly related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects?

Yes No

Remarks: Although this action is in concert with logging on Lone Rock Timber lands the federal contribution to cumulative impacts would not have a cumulatively significant impact on the environment beyond that already identified in the EIS.

8. Has adverse effects on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places?

Yes No

Remarks: The Cultural Report does not indicate that this action would not adversely affect any sites, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

9. May adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973?

Aquatic Species	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Botanical Species	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No
Terrestrial Species	<input type="radio"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No

Remarks: Consultation with NMFS was not required due to "no effect" finding for listed fish. Botanical surveys do not indicate the presence of any T&E plants. A letter of concurrence from the FWS (July 2, 2001) concluded that activity "is not likely to adversely affect spotted owls". The action was determined to be of no effect for other T&E animals.

10. Threatens to violate Federal, State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment. Yes No

Remarks: We find that this action would not threaten a violation of Federal, State, local or tribal law imposed for the protection of the environment.